CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 5. AUGUST, 1917. Vol. VII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

ıe Cambridge Conference.

The Fourth Conference of Modern Churchmen is being ld at Cambridge as we go to press. Notwithstanding the fficulties entailed by the war, the numbers attending it ceed those of its three predecessors. The September *odern Churchman*—a double number—will contain an count of the Conference, and as full a selection of the pers and sermons delivered at it as our space will permit.

---

enighted Australians.

The Senior Chaplain of the Australian Imperial Force in *News from No Man's Land** has drawn up a table ranged in parallel columns, of those religious topics which, m the soldiers' point of view, he has found to be dead and ose which he has found to be alive:—

Dead Topics.	*Live Topics.*
Future Punishment.	Personal Salvation.
Baptismal Regeneration.	Prayer and Providence.
Apostolic Succession.	Comradeship and Communion.
Claims of the Church.	Christ as Friend and Lord.
Sabbath Observance and Church Ordinances.	Righteousness.
Sectarian and all Church Shibboleths.	God as a Ruler.
	Here, hereafter, and the Soul's destiny.

This is a very disconcerting list, for it is plain that if this y of looking at things becomes general among our seven llion fighting men, we shall get back quite quickly to the noptic Gospels, and have very little use for all our later

* *News from No Man's Land*, by James Green. Pub. by C. H. Kelly, price 1/6.

ecclesiastical constructions and deductions. A great write once remarked that what distinguished Christ from the Rabbi was the fewness of the things He taught as needful fo salvation. Suceeeding generations of Christian teachers hav felt this to be one of the defects of His Gospel, and have don their best to supplement it, forgetting, in their endeavours the Master's condemnation of those who taught as Divin precepts the commandments of men.

Ecclesio-centric or Christo-centric Christianity?

In his *Challenge to the Church*,* Mr. Temple publishes letter of quite unusual insight written to him in answer to a invitation to attend a conference to discuss the problems whic will confront us after the war, and the part that the Churc might play in solving them. The letter runs:—

> "I am rather doubtful about accepting. On the one hand I fee that the war has drawn all of us who care about these things ver closely together, but at the same time I feel convinced that nothin short of an earthquake can make the organised religious bodies equa to the opportunity. We shall be just a few people meeting in a roo to say revolutionary things; and that old Juggernaut, the Church, wit its set traditions, will go on riding over us in the old ruts. It is quit certain, surely, that whatever we say or think the Churches will not:
>
> (1) Adopt a religious as against a theological test of membershi (yet why should you ask others to begin where you hav arrived after ten years' thinking?)
>
> (2) Make up their own silly quarrels, in which no one outside the own professional ranks takes any interest.
>
> (3) Turn theology into a live subject by allowing free discussio either in the church or the vestry.
>
> (4) Make the churches and chapels what they ought to be—th social centres of the district instead of empty shells.
>
> (5) Give full scope to laymen of both sexes as ministers of th Gospel.
>
> (6) Forget that the churches have 'interests' of their own, an always think of the cause first, and all organised bodies as i unworthy ministers.
>
> "Fifty years hence, I am sure, the Church, if there be one, will b discussing this kind of thing. But then it will be too late. What

A Challenge to the Church, by W. Temple. Pub. S.P.C.K., price 1/3.

always feel in talking to organised religious people is that Church people are syndicalists to the bone; they are *ecclesio-centric*. They cannot get outside the purview of their own organisation any more than the German can get outside the German state. Yet if they believe in the cause for which their organisation professedly exists, they ought not to care a rap how men get into touch with the Divine, and ought to be joyfully confident, instead of nervously apologetic, that more and more pilgrims will choose their road to walk on. I often feel that the Church is altogether too 'anxious to help,' like a superfluous official who is desperately anxious to appear to be doing something for fear of getting the sack. What if he did? The work would go on. The Church of England must seem a very small thing to the Holy Spirit. One is almost ashamed to mention the two in the same breath "

There is a breath of mountain air about this, but we fear that to the great bulk of the clergy and ministers of religion, it will not seem anything but deleterious nonsense.

Church Reforms.

A little pamphlet, *Life and Liberty*,* by Mr. Temple, sketches various Church reforms which the Life and Liberty movement desires to secure, but which it believes cannot be secured without altering the present relation of the Church to Parliament.

(1) It is desired to re-distribute Church incomes. Such a judicious re-distribution, Mr. Temple believes, would encourage generosity on the part of the laity in contributing to the support of their clergy. We are disposed to think it would very largely remove the necessity so far as the beneficed clergy are concerned. Such a re-distribution as Mr. Temple desires can no doubt only be effected by going to Parliament, but the body to carry out these changes must certainly appear to many to be the Ecclesiastical Commissioners when the remarkable work that this body has performed since its establishment in 1840, in endowing new benefices and increasing the value of poor ones, is properly grasped. We have no desire to seem to oppose financial reform which has a great attraction for many minds, but we confess it seems to us to be the least pressing as

* Macmillans, price 3d.

it is the easiest kind of reform. The episcopal incomes seem very large to those who have not got the spending of them, but with the prospect of income tax rising to 10/- in the £, reforms of this kind are better postponed.

(2) It is desired to establish parochial councils with legal powers to control the "autocracy of the parson," and to give the laity a veto in the appointment of the autocrat. We have urged this strongly on a number of occasions, and our complaint in connection with the Report on Church and State is that this reform is placed *seventh* instead of *first* in their proposals. When Peace comes Parliament would probably sanction such a proposal easily enough.

(3) It is desired to reform the Cathedral Chapters. The Bishop of London recently expressed a desire to abolish Deans apparently because (*a*) a bishop could not preach in his cathedral without receiving the dean's permission, and (*b*) the deans (some 30 or so) collectively drew an income of £41,000 (the bishop inadvertently stated it to be £70,000) and this vast sum, about four times the bishop's own income he felt very naturally might be better spent in endowing new bishoprics. Mr. Temple desires capitular reform in order that the bishop may reside in the cathedral close (if we recollect rightly the late Bishop of Bristol did so for a little while, and got away as quickly as he could) and encourage the chapter to work hard under his directions in combining diocesan work with their capitular functions. We do not favour this proposal. Our over-worked bishops ought to be glad to have the cathedral managed by a dean, and not to have it added to their cares. A far better proposal, although Mr. Temple does not mention it, is that the Dean and minor canons should be retained to manage the cathedral, and that all the canons residentiary should be relieved entirely of their cathedral duties, and be quartered in the episcopal palace (or elsewhere if the bishop desires it) to assist the bishop in the work of the diocese. Moreover if it would ease the episcopal and decanal relations

in certain cases, it might also be enacted that the bishop may preach in the cathedral whenever he wishes to do so on giving due notice to the dean of his intention.

(4) It is desired to increase the archbishoprics to eight or nine, and to carve out eight new dioceses in the Southern Province. No doubt sub-division in some dioceses is desirable, but we believe this need to be greatly exaggerated in these days of motors. We venture to think that in a number of cases more time spent in their dioceses would relieve our bishops' difficulties; but the best remedy we can imagine for episcopal inability to overtake episcopal work would be to require all bishops to resign their sees at sixty-five years of age. A bishop in the prime of life in a motor-car attended by a squadron of canons residentiary on motor-cycles would we are sure immediately satisfy the ideals of all those who associate inspiration with perspiration, and measure personal influence with a cyclometer. In any case we believe that an Episcopal Early Retiring Bill would have no difficulty in getting through Parliament.

(5) Mr. Temple feels "that there are no men of leading positions in the Church who are set free from administrative detail to consider large questions of policy and the relation of the Church to the main problems of the day." Now if our proposal that the bishops should retire at sixty-five were acted on, we should then have an admirable body consisting of these retired bishops who with the addition of Regius Professors, Principals of Theological Colleges, the capitular Deans, and a large body of eminent and leisured laymen and laywomen could easily do whatever Mr. Temple wants done.

But, and here is the crucial question, if the Wesleyans can go to Parliament, as they intend going, to obtain an act which will permit an important alteration in the Wesleyan Trust Deed, why cannot the Church go to Parliament at the same time and obtain a Church Reform Act embodying the desirable reforms we have suggested? The reason is not that Parliament

would not pass a plain, practical measure of this sort, but that the Church authorities could never agree sufficiently to promote such a measure, and no change in the constitutional relation of Church and State is going to give us that unity of spirit or the power to use effectively whatever freedom we possess.

The Only Way to Unity.

A distinguished Methodist C.F. recently told a large Methodist gathering that it was the officials of all the Christian denominations who were the real barriers to re-union. The non-official classes were ready for re-union, and if it were not for their ministers, would soon have it. If his judgment be sound, and we think it is, the present methods of seeking re-union must be abandoned. Ecclesiastics must be ignored. They are the fine flowers of their systems. With their traditions and their timidities, their reputations and their refinements, their positions and their prospects, they represent that section of each community which is least capable of seeing things in a broad, simple, practical way, They see—it is the result of their training—all the prejudices of the past, all the historic controversies, all the wrongs, all the triumphs of their denomination arrayed against re-union. They have been trained to study these things and to use them for controversial purposes, and these rise up as lions in the path of re-union, and growl so fiercely that few ecclesiastics have the heart to attempt to advance past them. In the third century B.C. the Chinese Emperor, Shih Hwang Tî, decreed that all books of history should be destroyed throughout his dominions. If only all books of controversial and ecclesiastical theology throughout the world might be similarly treated, or, at least, all Christian teachers forbidden to read them under pain of excommunication, there might be some hope of re-union under the leadership of our ecclesiastics. At present it is hopeless. Their progenitors divided the Christian world, and their descendants keep us apart.

How, then, must the re-unionists proceed? They must plan nd organise without regard to their denominational officials. n short, they must organise on lay inter-denominational lines. When their organisation is complete; when they have a clear olicy and a united front they can then deal with the officials nd trust-deeds of their respective denominations. They will hen observe how the clericalists of all denominations will ombine temporarily in order to demonstrate the absolute need or remaining separate.

The recent visit of the Bishops of London and Chelmsford o the Wesleyan Conference, and the very courteous reception ccorded to them, will cause gratification, but it does not mean e-union. The Wesleyans fear absorption. They fear the igidity and ritualism of Anglicanism. All that their officials lesire is to receive ecclesiastical and social recognition from our officials, and that they will not receive until the Church of England is liberalised. We are told that a democratized Germany would find it easy to make terms of peace with the Allies; equally a liberalised Anglicanism would have little difficulty in arranging terms of co-operation and communion with the various Nonconformist denominations.

The liberalising process is now proceeding steadily in all the separated bodies, especially among the younger men. When it has advanced farther and deeper, re-union will come about comparatively easily.

Meanwhile, ecclesiastical amenities are to be commended, but, like compliments, they must not be taken seriously. When the Bishop of London and the President of the Wesleyan Conference both kneel together at the Holy Communion, we shall know that each recognises the other as a fellow-Christian. The Holy Communion, whatever else it be, is still for Christians the symbol of Christian fellowship ("a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another."—*Art.* xxviii.), and we have no mind to be put off with counterfeit substitutes.

A New Way of Treating Heresy.

Heresy in doctrine, which is sometimes due to ignorance an self-conceit, and sometimes due to knowledge and humility, i a difficult subject to handle in days of mental disquiet, whe infallibility is discredited and the sense of overwhelmin mystery is stronger than ever. As a consequence, open heresy hunting by the ecclesiastical authorities has been abandonec It was expensive and it was troublesome, and the court seemed to shew an increasing unwillingness to convict. As sport it gave too evident enjoyment to the general public to b viewed with sympathy by religious persons. As a matter c business it yielded but poor results. Secret heresy-huntin has, however, been pursued with considerable vigour of lat years. The most unlicensed sort being in the correspondenc columns of the Church Press, and the most deadly that whic consisted of insinuating charges of heresy which were neve definitely formulated, and so could never be satisfactoril rebutted, but were taken as proved.

The Wesleyans, according ro the report furnished by it special correspondent to the *Christian Commonwealth* of Aug 1st, appear to have found a better way of dealing with heres charges. At the recent Conference it was intended to charg three ministers with heterodoxy. They were three young men and the Rev. W. R. Maltby speaking as the representative o the younger generation proposed a plan which met with genera acceptance.

> "He affirmed that there was real need for some body of consultatio and conciliation, where open and brotherly discussion of difficulties c differences might take place before any further and more formal step were taken. His plea that we are living in times of extraordinar tension and gravity, and that problems far wider than any personal c strictly Methodist concerns are now agitating all minds, calling for more Christian spirit and method than any 'charges,' was heartil endorsed by the Conference. After several speakers had followed, i confirmation of Mr. Maltby, it was agreed that all charges should b withdrawn, and some eight brethren were requested to join with M Maltby in forming a fairly representative body of men to consider wha could be done to ensure harmony of spirit and, as far as possible, c

doctrinal teaching. The wisdom and importance of this arrangement can scarcely be over-estimated. There can be no longer any secret about the fact that serious differences of opinion and teaching are found in the many pulpits of Wesleyan Methodism, and the attitude of the younger—and it must be said abler—men towards the rigidity of the reputed 'standards' of Wesleyan Methodism, as found in the Sermons and Notes of John Wesley, is slowly but surely becoming more pronounced. The attempt of a well-meaning but narrow-visioned minority to enforce these 'standards' with meticulous exactness and threatened penalties is more and more resented. The legal stronghold of the minority, like that of the 'Wee Frees' in Scotland, consists in a document, known in this case as the Poll Deed. So that this connection with law, together with the extreme undesirability in these days of causing anything like a 'split' in the Church, makes it very desirable to go gently, even in those modifications of doctrine which every man possessing mind as well as heart must see are now really essential. It may well be, therefore, that the plan now proposed and accepted with such cordiality may prove to be one of the wisest and most hopeful of the matters transacted at the Conference of 1917."

The special correspondent's account of the transaction, and his comments on it, may be commended to the attention of those diocesans, who feel that their promise at consecration "to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word" ought to be carried out, and yet know not how best to do it.

The Church Franchise.

The *Challenge* of July 20th publishes a letter by the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews protesting against the communicant test as the qualification for the Church Franchise. He believes that such a test would enfranchise many who are spiritually dead and exclude many who are spiritually alive. This is obvious enough when we take off our ecclesiastical spectacles and have a look at human life as it is, but we doubt whether any thorough-going Sacramentalist will see it. We, too, object to the communicant test partly on Mr. Matthews' grounds, partly on other grounds. But what is most attractive about Mr. Matthews' letter is not its negative but its positive side. He makes the following suggestion, which will certainly secure

the deep interest, and, we hope, the strong support of all Liberal Churchmen. He writes:—

> "I believe that if we had some perfectly simple, positive test calculated to include all men of good-will in every parish, we should not only find our whole Church life renewed by the Spirit of Christ, but also the cause of reunion would immediately become more hopeful than ever before. I suggest, for instance, that the would-be voter should be asked to sign a declaration that he (or she) earnestly desires the coming of the Kingdom of God, and believes that society can only be redeemed through the spreading abroad of the Spirit of Christ, and that in this faith he desires to take part in the life and work of the Church."

Mr. Matthews hopes that the Life and Liberty Movement will support such a qualification for the Church vote. We hope so too, but we shall be as delighted as we shall be surprised if it does. There are not a few Liberal Churchmen who regard the Life and Liberty Movement with apprehension, notwithstanding the excellent men associated with it, and the Archbishops' very cordial reception of its representatives. They feel that the Church has as much freedom at present as is good for her, and that if the Movement proves successful from the promotors' point of view, it will merely liberate the Church from Parliamentary control, to bind her much more closely in ecclesiastical fetters. If, however, the promotors of the movement would pledge themselves publicly to work for the franchise qualification which Mr. Matthews suggests, they would, at least, make it clear that they have no intention of narrowing the Church and segregating it from the national life. Mr. Temple recognises this danger, and has recently written:—

> "The most serious danger is that the Church may become narrow and lose its habit of tolerance. If the veto of the State is retained this danger will be greatly diminished. But it will be there. During the nineteenth century representatives of all the three parties in the Church which had real life and power of movement in them—High, Low, and Broad—were successively condemned by ecclesiastical authority and owed their position in the Church to the tolerance imposed upon it by the secular power. We have moved since then; but it is still possible that, when the battle of Liberty for the Church is won, the battle of Liberty within the Church will have still to be fought."—(*Life and Liberty*, p. 17).

A comprehensive Church Franchise would reduce this danger. What Franchise does the the Life and Liberty Movement stand for?

SENTIMENTALISTS AND CASUISTS.

By the Editor.

The good influence of the Christian Religion is not only hecked by outside foes but is also weakened by two classes ithin its ranks. The first of these is the Christian senti- nentalist.

The Christian sentimentalist is one who will not face the acts of life. He will not see things as they are. The world or him is not the world as it is, but the world of his dreams. The world as he would like it to be. The Christian Religion s for him the religion for this world of dreams. It is the sweet Galilaean vision, which as soon as it shines on human life makes it good, beautiful, and joyous. Now, while we admit hat imagination and idealism serve great purposes in life, ve ought to observe that what is really useful is scientific magination and rational idealism, not the sentimental varieties.

The ordinary man who might be won to higher things by a scientific and reasonable Christianity, turns away from the sentimental variety as something only suitable to a few people who are far too good for this world. Thus the Christian sentimentalist, who believes himself to be Christianity's best friend, often proves to be its enemy by repelling from it many ntelligent persons who would be all the better for being Christians.

The other inside enemy of Christianity is the Christian casuist or sophist. We use the term in its popular sense of one who seeks to apply the principles of the Christian Religion to the actual conditions of human life. This, however, he does not by indicating how our daily life, our eating and drinking, our politics and industrialism, our recreation and trading, our sexual and domestic relations, our art and science and education, should conform to Christian principles and bear witness to the hallowing influence of the Spirit of Christ, but by producing specious reasons for permitting us to follow our baser inclinations

at the expense of Christian principles while yet professing t guide our lives by the teaching of Christ. Thus the Christia casuist deprives the Gospel salt of its savour. This wa Pascal's charge against the Jesuit Probabilists. There ar however, many casuists who are not Jesuits. Every man his own casuist in his hour of temptation if he be not watchfu It is difficult to decide whether the casuist or the sentimentali is the more dangerous foe to our religion. The casuist i however, much the more common. There are a hundre Mr. Worldly-Wisemans to every single Don Quixote.

At present we see both classes in evidence. The search-ligh of the war has made them clearly visible. The casuists ar for the most part, the militarists. We see them perfectl developed in men of the Kaiser type. The sentimentalists ar in the ranks of the pacifists. Yet at his stage the sentimentalis have largely departed from the pacifist ideal. They recognis now with sorrow, as every humane being must, that in th world, human nature being what it is, there are occasions whe war is a dire necessity—occasions when armed force whic sheds human blood must be called into use. In this view the are true to the best and sanest of Christian teaching—tha teaching which is neither sentimental nor casuistical. Whe Christ said to the centurion: "I have not found so great faith no, not in Israel," it is clear that He did not regard th profession of arms as necessarily inconsistent with moral an spiritual enlightenment. When St. Peter admitted Cornelius to the Christian Church, after his reception of the Holy Spiri he made no condition that his convert must first cease to be soldier. Even a Christian soldier who would die rather tha wear a garland on his heathen emperor's birthday, lest h might seem thereby to be offering religious devotion to th Divine genius of the emperor, would have no hesitation charging the Quadi[1] at the command of the same emperc

[1] A German tribe, said by Tertullian and others to have been overcome by the prayers a arms of a Christian legion. See *Apol.* 5; *Ad Scap.* 4; and also Eusebius *Ecc. Hist.* v. 5

he Christian Church (in contrast to certain sects) has never clared that the Christian soldier was a breaker of the mmand, "Thou shalt not kill," when he slew his enemy in ttle, nor has she ever declared that the soldier as a voluntary actual murderer, is unfitted for membership in the Christian hurch. Rather her attitude towards the soldier has been iat of St. Paul towards the magistrate: "He beareth not the vord in vain." There are occasions when human blood must e shed; not because the shedding of human blood is not an vil thing, but because it is in this world of grim realities the sser of two evils. A number of our Christian sentimentalists ave now come round to the same conclusion, and admit, as ur XXXVII. Article teaches, that:—

> "It is lawful for Christian men, at the commandment of the Magistrate, to wear weapons, and serve in the wars" *(justa bella)*.

The wars, however, are not any wars but righteous wars.[2] Vars waged to defend freedom and right against barbarian utrage and criminal violence. If such wars were not waged, vilisation would be destroyed, and criminals and savages ule mankind.

At present, then, the sentimentalists are mainly concerned ot as to whether war may be waged, and is not rightly waged gainst German militarism, but as to how it ought to be waged. his is a matter in which the Christian Church has consistently xercised a humanising influence. She has not, indeed, riven so much as she ought to limit the occasions of warfare, ut she has striven steadily to humanise it by teaching the uty of mercifulness towards the conquered and the obligation f sparing the defenceless. As the influence of the Christian hurch produced a mitigation of the horrors of war when ome was taken by the Vandals in 455, so it has on many ccasions since. The question, however, which is now vexing ie soul of the sentimentalist is whether the Christian Church ould sanction reprisals for German atrocities? It seems

[2] For some reason the word *justa* in the Latin Article has disappeared from the English Article, although both Latin and English are of equal authority.

clear to him she ought not. He does not, as many do, protes on the ground that reprisals are ineffective (that is not a sentimental but a practical ground for protest), but on the ground that they are inhuman and therefore un-Christian On the other hand, those who advocate the lawfulness o reprisals declare that their motive in advocating them is a humanitarian one. As to whether reprisals are protective, they leave to military and naval experts to decide; they, the Christian teachers, inheritors of the authority of the Keys faced with the duty of deciding what is and what is not in accordance with Christian principles, declare that if reprisal are the best means of protecting non-combatants, they are morally permissible. In speaking thus, they incur a most serious responsibility, but, at least, they do not shirk it by remaining silent. While forbidding reprisals on the ground of revenge they permit them on the ground of humanitarianism, *i.e.*, with the object of putting an end to such treacherous outrages as the Germans have committed. The Germans have deliberately adopted these methods, because they hope to win the war by them. They hold that one instrument of success which such outrages gives them is "frightfulness," or the power to terrorize their enemies. The Germans, and all who would follow their example, need to learn that frightfulness is a weapon which not only does not avail, but may be used with terrible effect against themselves. To show a criminal that he can be hoist with his own petard is the best way to prevent criminals from making use of petards. With other sorts of men direct appeals to their moral feelings not to use petards are more effective.

Our sentimentalists need to study human nature more closely than they do, and we venture to recommend to them for this purpose Bishop Butler's *Fifteen Sermons on Human Nature and Ethics* (which they can probably purchase second-hand for 6d.) especially sermons viii. and ix. Upon Resentment and Upon Forgiveness of Injuries. Butler would have reasoned that reprisals should spring from the dual motives of good-will

nd of resentment; good-will being a sincere desire for the eneral good of humanity, and resentment being that feeling vhich is roused by wrong-doing and prompts us to punish it. Resentment is," as he points out, "not inconsistent with good-vill," neither is it inconsistent with forgiveness. Forgiveness nd punishment will be guided by a careful consideration of vhat is for the good of humanity as a whole. We shall not eel so much compassion for the criminals that we shall have one to spare for the past and possible future victims of their rimes. In no case shall we forgive the impenitent, for that vill be to weaken the moral law which it is our duty to assert, nd which is the bond by which society is held together for the ood of the whole and of each of its units. Christ nowhere aught that God forgives the impenitent, nor does He teach hat man should do so. Sentimentalists often seem to err in hree directions.

First, they have *compassion as an emotion*, and so they cry ut against such terrible acts as those of which the Germans ave been guilty, but they do not seem to have *compassion as motive*, or they would support the most effective steps (which xperts advise) to put a stop to such horrid crimes.

Secondly, they seem to be weak in their power of moral esentment, that "generous movement of the mind" as Butler alls it. They do not seem to realise how needful it is rom the point of view of morality and the higher good of umanity—that horrid crimes should be severely punished. They do not seem to recognise that softness and readiness to orgive (not personal injuries but evil conduct) may be a vice nd do most deadly injury to human character, and cause most pernicious results in human society. As Butler writes:—

> "It is necessary for the very subsistence of the world that injury, injustice, and cruelty should be punished, and since compassion which is so natural to mankind, would render the execution of that justice exceedingly difficult and uneasy, indignation against vice and wickedness is a balance to that weakness of pity, and also to anything which would prevent the necessary methods of severity. . . . Those who have never thought upon these subjects may perhaps not see the weight of this." (Sermon viii.).

Thirdly, they do not see human nature as the experience of life exhibits it to us both at its best and at its worst. While regarding it as sacred on the one hand, as reflecting the image of God, they do not seem to realise that human nature can act divinely. They do not seem to realise that it is possible to punish with a powerful feeling of good-will towards the criminal, and to be ever-ready to forgive him on seeing signs of penitence. Such action seems to them to savour of hypocrisy. Such might do well to study the Pope's administration of justice in the case of Guido so marvellously analysed in Browning's *The Ring and the Book* (x.). On the other hand they do not seem to realise that some human beings can become so callous or perverted morally that direct moral appeals are made to them in vain. They must be appealed to through suffering, as Butler writes:—

> "Men are plainly restrained from injuring their fellow-creatures by fear of their resentment, and it is very happy that they are so, when they would not be restrained by a principle of virtue."

The strongest moral argument against reprisals is that some are punished by them who are not actually guilty. In so far as unarmed Germans approve of the atrocious methods of their government they are guilty of its crimes, as guilty as though they had themselves actually bombed London or torpedoed the *Lusitania*. In the cases of others, particularly children, they are not guilty, and those who undertake reprisals would spare them if they could separate them from their guilty countrymen. This they are hardly able to do. In this their situation is, if we may say it with reverence, that of the Divine Being Himself. Bishop Butler points out in his *Analogy*[3] that God governs the world by general laws, laws framed for men as a race of related beings, not as an aggregate of separate individuals. The advantage of government by these general laws is much greater than the disadvantage. One advantage is that men benefit greatly by the virtues of others, and the general progress of mankind. But the disadvantage of govern-

[3] Part i. ch. vii. Part . ch. iv.

nt by general laws is that we suffer for the sins of others—
ldren for the sins of their parents, and parents for the sins of
ir children. However, even the fact that others suffer for our
s has certain compensating results. For instance, the know-
ge that our evil conduct will involve others, even those
irest and dearest to us, is one of the greatest deterrents to evil
ng. The knowledge by the Germans that in killing English
oes they are also killing their own may well prove a greater
terrent than the loss of their own lives. But the question is
s:—If the innocent cannot be separated from the guilty,
ght the guilty therefore to be spared and allowed to continue
punished their evil ways? It is not for the good of humanity
it the guilty should be spared even though the innocent
ould suffer with them. When Germans advanced behind
lgian women to invade Belgium, Belgian patriots fired on
e Germans though they slew their own women in doing so.
It is terrible to have to face such questions, and it may seem
erly repulsive to have to decide in this way. It would give
many (including the writer of this article) an immense sense
emotional relief to say: Though all the babes in England
e to be blown to pieces by German airmen, and though you
ght protect them all by blowing to pieces a single German
oe, it is better for you as a nation, and for humanity as a
ole in regard to its future moral progress, that your nation
ould perish but leave this memorial behind it that you would
t do this deed, and defile your hands with innocent blood.
t if the writer decided thus, his reason and conscience would
l him almost ere the applause had died away that he had
osed into sentimentalism. If the only way to protect
equately an English babe is to kill a German babe, then it
the duty of our authorities, however repugnant, to do it.
ore particularly is this so, when we reflect that that innocent
rman babe will in all probability grow up to be a killer
babes himself, or at least an enthusiastic advocate of that
rrible policy of frightfulness of which the killing of babes is
e of the features. Whereas the English babe whose life is
red by this means will, we may reasonably anticipate, grow
to be a protector of babes, and a detestor of those who
uld slay them.

WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

It is a great and momentous thing when a monarchy fal and a government changes its form; it is a greater and mo momentous thing when the Church of a people falls and religion changes its vesture. For, as Carlyle expresses it:—

> "The government is but the outward *skin* and *body* Politic, holdi the whole together and protecting it, but Religion is the inm Pericardial and Nervous Tissue which ministers life and wa circulation to the whole."

And so it is that, intensely interesting as is the politic upheaval in Russia, of still deeper interest is the announceme recently made that:—

> "The Holy Synod has resigned in a body . . . a new Synod is be elected immediately, and its first work will be to prepare for a spee convocation of a Church Council, which will discuss the urgent proble of Church Reform."

We may be certain that that particular Council, with t impetus of new birth upon it, will not content itself wi academic discussions, but will decide and act and purge a establish to right good purpose. It will be of peculiar interes having regard to the extremely religious temperament of t Russian people, to see how their needs will be met by Council doubtless of democratic sympathies and understandi

It is significant how many countries are at the prese moment in the act of changing either the outward form their religion, or still further, the very essence of their religio belief; in fact there are as momentous issues pending in t religious as in the political world.

There is China, emerging from idolatry and ancestor worsh centuries old, debating in its parliament the desirability proclaiming Christianity as the official religion of the Empi

Japan, with her thousands of enquiring students, is looki round and weighing well before deciding which shall be t new religion of her adoption. To quote the words of Japanese high official:—

"Hoping and believing that a real Japanese Christianity will evolve and be a beacon light in the path of the Japanese people in the progress of civilization."

Africa's gods are fast disappearing into the limbo of the past d being replaced by Christian and Mohammedan worship; ıile India is pleading, in groups of thousands, scattered over vast territory, for religious enlightenment and instruction.

Most astonishing of all, perhaps, we are assured on good thority, that—

"There is marked evidence of the disintegration of Islam as a centralized religion."

Who can over-estimate the significance of these simultaneous ovements in the moral progress of mankind?

As for ourselves, what lover of our English Church at home nnot see that reconstruction, great and far-reaching, is nding in the near future? From the fullest communion of e Church of England to the smallest gathering of a Christian ct a sense of restlessness prevails.

The Kikuyu incident revealed, as in a flash, the wide gulf at exists between the ideal and practice of the Church's stem and the ideal and practice of the Church's Founder; d only the distraction of the war averted, in all probability, e disruption of the whole edifice as a consequence.

"Organised Christianity"—to use the new term—has con-ssedly lost its hold upon the people; doctrines and creeds ed to be revised and re-presented to the enlightened modern ind, but party spirit and disunion block the way; even the oud traditions and history of the Church have become a ag upon her progress. Confusion is everywhere, and it is easy matter to apply the right remedies.

When the Oriental does not know what to do, he sits down d awaits developments. The Western mind in a like case, lls back upon first principles for inspiration, and to the writer any rate, it has been an immense comfort and illumination read again what the wise old Seer of Chelsea had to say on the matter. He reminds us that—

"Church clothes are but the Forms, the Vestures, under which men at various periods, embody and represent for themselves the Religious Principle. They are spun and woven by Society (itself made possible by Religion) and Society, past and present, may well be figured as properly and wholly a Church in one or other of these three predicaments:—An audibly preaching and prophesying Church, which is the best; second, a Church that struggles to preach and prophesy, but cannot as yet, till its Pentecost come; and third and worst, a Church gone dumb with old age, or which only mumbles delirium prior to dissolution."[1]

He admits that in our era, those same Forms and Vestures are sadly out at elbows, and many have become mere hollow shapes, or staring glass-eyed masks, under which no living Spirit any longer dwells. Religion may have quite withdrawn from the mask, but—

"In unnoticed nooks she is weaving for herself new vestures, with which to reappear and bless us or our sons or grandsons."

The Golden age is before, not behind us. True there will be a funeral pyre and sparks flying for such Phoenix birth,—and how long men will stave off the hated change, and how long the cremation process will take, who can tell? What matter so long as—

"The old sick Society be effectually burnt, in the faith that she is a Phoenix, and that a new heaven-born young one will rise out of her ashes."

Proof that the Seer of Chelsea is right is not wanting. France, a few short years ago, attended the funeral pyre of her "Organised Religion," and already out of the desolation, so one of her eminent psychologists[2] was able to proclaim shortly before the war, the Phoenix birth had taken place, and amongst her people, especially the poorer classes, there was evolving itself a simple, direct, spiritual Religion from which he augured the very best for France's future.

"Watchman, what of the night? the day cometh . . ."

E. Howell.

[1] *Sartor Resartus*, Book III.
[2] *France To-day*, by Paul Sabatier.

JESUS AND THE PROOF FROM SCRIPTURE.

By the Rev. W. M. Pryke, B.D.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss the question whether Jesus made e of the proof from scripture in support of His claim to Messiahship. In rtain passages of the Gospels He is represented as having sought to erpret His sufferings by the light of prophecy; nor can there be any doubt to the importance attached by the writers of the New Testament to this e of argument. We have then to ask: were they right in attributing is apologetic use of the Old Testament to Jesus, or is it more probable that e systematic employment of the argument from prophecy in explanation the Messiah's sufferings and death dates from a period subsequent to the surrection appearances, and cannot therefore be justly referred back to the storic Jesus? In the opinion of the writer the latter alternative is alone ssible. The following points scarcely require elaboration:—

(1) The sole question at issue between the Jew and the members of the earliest Christian community was that of the Messiahship of Jesus.

(2) In face of Deuteronomy xxi. 23, the Jew could not accept as Messiah one who had died by crucifixion.

(3) For the Christian the stumbling-block of the cross was removed by the belief in the resurrection.

(4) Mere assertions on the part of the Christians were powerless to overcome the Jewish contention that the Old Testament knew nothing of a suffering Christ.

(5) The Christians were also Jews. The contending parties held precisely the same views with regard to the inspiration of scripture, and were accustomed to apply to it the same arbitrary methods of exegesis.

(6) The Christian apologist was therefore bound to seek for, and to find in scripture, definite predictions of a suffering and rising Christ.

These considerations explain sufficiently the use made of the Old stament by the primitive Church, and the supreme importance attached Christian writers to the supposed testimony it afforded to the sufferings d death of Jesus of Nazareth. Even were it proved decisively, not merely t Jesus made no use of the proof from scripture in explanation of His ferings, but that the disciples never thought of Him as Messiah until after resurrection appearances, the interest of the Christian community in the

Old Testament would still be amply accounted for. Once make th equation: "The Messiah is Jesus," and the use of the proof from scriptu crucifixion be overcome. It remains to be considered on what grounds th earliest apologists for Christianity, the writers of the New Testamen believed themselves to be justified in citing the authority of Jesus Hims for the use of the Old Testament in the interests of the new faith. What the evidence for and nature of this authority?

Literary and historical criticism are alike concerned with the answer the question thus raised. Accepting Harnack's reconstruction of Q., w find that it contains but one hint of the employment of the proof fro scripture by Jesus, viz., "This is he of whom it is written, behold I send m messenger before thy face who shall prepare thy way before thee"—of Joh the Baptist—Mt. xi. 10.[1]

The verse agrees with Mk. i. 2 in reading "Before *thy* face" and "befo *thee*" where the Hebrew has "The way before *me*," and the LXX. "A wa before *my* face." The apparently slight change made in Mk. and Mt in order to render the words suitable for Christian use, entirely transform the meaning of the original. The verse becomes an address by Jahweh t the Messiah. Now such a change, though fully understandable if made b the community, is scarcely likely to have been the work of the writer of Q who does not, apart from this passage, evince the slightest interest in th proof from scripture. Still less is such a use of the passage probable in th mouth of Jesus, who was not wont so to juggle with the words of the O Testament in order to force from them support for His Messianic claim Thus, in the source which contains admittedly the most authentic teachin of Christ, a source, moreover, which attributes to Him the most astoundin claims, a source "which affords us the strongest imaginable testimony tha Q. is dominated by the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus,"[2] there absolutely no evidence, apart from one highly suspicious passage, tha Christ Himself ever made use of the proof from scripture in support of H claims.

How stands the matter in Mk., and in Mt. and Lk., where they are n dependent either on Mk. or Q.? There are but nine passages in th Synoptics, apart from the one already considered, where the use of th proof from scripture is attributed to Jesus. Therefore He did not use systematically. It can have had for Him no central importance, and at mo

[1] The verse is denied to Q. by J. Weiss. "*Vers* 10 *wird in Q. noch nicht gestanden hab Dieser Elias-Glaube erscheint also als ein Stück Theologie des Matthäus.*" S.N.T. S. 3 In view of Mk. ix. 12, ff., it may be a mistake to describe the verse as a piece of t theology of Matthew. But that it can be ascribed to Jesus Himself, or indeed tha stood in Q. at all, seems highly questionable on other grounds.

[2] Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, p. 243.

can only have employed it occasionally. The passages are Mk. ix. 12, ff, parallels, Mk. xiv. 21, and parallels, Mk. xiv. 27, and parallels, Mk. xiv. ows as a matter of course. By no other means could the difficulty of the and parallels, Mt. xxvi. 54, Lk. xviii. 31 to 33, xxii. 37, and xxiv. 25 ff. 44 to 46. The risen Christ, not the historical Jesus, is the speaker in Lk. v. Mk. ix. 12 ff, xiv. 21 and 49, Mt. xxvi. 54, and Lk. xviii. 31, may be sidered together. Here the wording is general and formal without the ition of particular Old Testament passages. In every case the subject he verses is the same, viz., the tragic fate of Jesus as in accordance with l conditioned by the testimony of scripture. Mk. ix. 12 ff. has no rallel in Lk. Mt. omits Mk.'s phrase "Even as it is written of him," in erence to the Baptist, and substitutes "So also the Son of Man must ffer of them" for Mk.'s "How is it written of the Son of Man that He ould suffer many things and be set at nought?"—Mt. xvii. 12. Thus the oof from scripture is only attributed to Jesus in Mk. Lk.'s parallel to k. xiv. 21 substitutes the phrase "As it hath been determined" for Mk.'s ore precise "As it hath been written concerning Him." Mt. follows Mk. art from the fullest familiarity with the proof from scripture, and its evious and regular use by Jesus, which is shewn to have been impossible, th by the evidence of the documents and the disciples' lack of mprehension—Mk. ix. 32, Lk. xviii. 34, these passages cannot be under- od. The same applies to Lk. xviii. 31 to 33. It presents the whole ssion story in a nut-shell, with an exact enumeration of details, introduced the formula, "All things that are written by the prophets shall be complished unto the Son of Man"—a formula which represents Jesus as iming that His delivery to the Gentiles, the mocking, shameful treatment, itting and scourging, to which He was subjected, together with His death d resurrection on the third day, one and all stood written in the prophets. ere it is possible to give definite proof that Lk. and not Jesus is the eaker—for in the parallel passages, Mt. xx. 17 to 19, Mk. x. 32 to 34, and so Lk. ix. 22 and 44, passages not in themselves less detailed—all ference to the scriptures is wanting. Further, such general references to suffering Messiah, based on the authority of the Old Testament, when we nsider the novelty, or rather repulsiveness, of the conception for Jewish ought, and also for the disciples—Mt. xvi. 22—would either have been together useless, or must have been intended only for those to whom e conception was already familiar. The inference is clear: here eaks a member of the Christian community, who looks back on a long aining in this method of proof, and not Jesus Himself. The words to the rvants at the arrest—Mk. xiv. 49—from their abrupt and general aracter, and in view of the audience to whom they are addressed, seem comprehensible and senseless in the mouth of Jesus. That here, too, the

evangelist is speaking, is shewn by the stereotyped formula with which Mt. concludes the narrative—"But all this is come to pass that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled" Mt. xxvi. 56. Lk. makes no reference to the scriptures at this point.

It is worth noticing that all the passages in which the employment of the proof from scripture is attributed to Jesus are concerned with the Passion. Is this an accident? Is it not rather a clear indication of the fact that Jesus' sufferings and death, even in the thought of His followers, presented at first the greatest difficulties, and that the stumbling-block of the cross was not fully overcome until the moment when the death of Jesus came to be regarded as in accordance with the divine decree for the Messiah, long ago revealed in the pages of scripture? Is it then to be wondered at that this liberating knowledge was referred back to Jesus Himself, and that the appeal to scripture precisely with reference to this point should have been placed in His mouth? The psychological necessity of representing Jesus as producing His own proofs from scripture in explanation of the tragic fate which awaited Him is easily explicable, and may be well illustrated from a passage in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 76):—

> "For though it had been obscurely proclaimed in the prophets that the Messiah should suffer and afterwards bear rule over all things, yet by no one could this be perceived until Christ Himself persuaded His apostles that these things had been expressly proclaimed in the scriptures."

That is to say, in view of the obscurity of the prophetic utterances precisely with regard to the Messiah's sufferings, detailed instruction on the part of Jesus Himself was deemed an obvious necessity. If we bear this in mind, the motives which produced the explicit statements of Lk. xxiv become clearly apparent.

In two only of the nine passages cited do we find a reference to a particular verse of the O.T. Mk. xiv. 27 is clear enough. The verse is retained by Mt. (xxvi. 31), but omitted by Lk., together with the following verse, which pre-supposes an appearance of Jesus to the disciples in Galilee. The flight of the disciples is predicted by Jesus, and by the citation of Zechariah xiii. 7 is represented as necessary to the fulfilment of scripture. The "because it is written" destroys every other possibility. We have here to do with an event divinely ordained, and notified in advance by the testimony of the Old Testament. "The appeal to prophecy is prompted by some uncomfortable fact which loses some of its discomfort when seen to be on the same line as other facts in old days. This is especially the motive governing the prophetic parallels which are violently pressed upon to explain the miserable fact that Jesus was betrayed by a disciple." It is useless to dispute whether Jesus

could foresee the flight of the disciples or not. Of course it was possible, but was it necessary, and with such exactness, only because a passage from scripture seemed to speak of it? For the disciples themselves, and for the primitive community, the flight must have been a hard fact, a stumbling-block, which one must seek to understand and to explain. The difficulty was removed at one stroke when the event was regarded in the light of an Old Testament prophecy, as in accordance with the will of God. In this way all reproach was removed from the disciples. Their flight had its place in the whole sum of suffering which the Messiah must experience. It was needful for Him to die deserted by His friends. Such was the unchangeable counsel of God as it stood revealed in scripture. Here also the community speaks, for whom the question was one of primary importance, and not Jesus. The passage must be placed in the same category as the naming of the traitor, or the detailed prediction of events in the Passion story. One and the same motive is predominant—the need to shew that events, even as regards details, cannot have taken Jesus by surprise, since all had been foretold in the divinely inspired pages of the Old Testament. Granting that the prediction of the disciples' flight may be historical, it is almost impossible to ascribe the citation of the prophecy to Jesus. "The verse of Zechariah (xiii. 7) is altered to suit its Christian application. Originally it is a summons by Jehovah Himself calling upon the sword to strike down a ruler who is making a bad use of his position as Jehovah's friend, and ruling sinfully." [3] Such an alteration, if it be the work of the community, is explicable enough, since by its means, "the uncomfortable fact" was robbed of its unpleasantness, but was it the habit of Jesus thus violently to press a prophetic parallel in order to explain and justify "the miserable fact" that his friends would desert Him in His hour of need? Dr. Swete's suggestion that the New Testament reading, "I will smite"—which disagrees both with the Hebrew and "all known forms of the Greek text," which have the imperative, "smite thou"—may be due to a collection of Testimonia from which the common tradition drew,[4] is interesting, and lends additional support to the belief that the quotation is due to the apologetic instincts of the community, and does not come from Jesus Himself.

The last remaining passage presents peculiar difficulties. Not that it alone can change the conclusion that the employment of the proof from scripture is to be attributed to the community and not to Jesus, but because the meaning of the passage as it stands is hard to determine. Lk. xxii. 37 reads as follows:—"For I say unto you that this which is written must be fulfilled in Me, and He was reckoned with transgressors: for that which

[3] Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 255.

[4] *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. 338.

concerneth Me hath fulfilment." The quotation is from Isaiah liii. 12, and is introduced by Jesus in confirmation of His advice to the disciples to sell their garments and buy swords. Yet how does this injunction fit in with what the other evangelists tell us—Mt. xxvi. 52—or with Luke's own statement in verse 51? The connexion of verses 35 to 38 is far from clear. Perhaps verse 38—which is connected in thought with verse 49—may be genuine; in that case verse 37 must originally have contained an announcement of hidden danger. The disciples propose to defend themselves with two swords which they have in their possession, and Jesus in bitter irony declares them to be sufficient. On this theory, verses 35 and 36 are a later addition. It seems probable that Luke, not wishing to omit the quotation, has given it this unfortunate position in his narrative. The phrase τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ is not found elsewhere, but the plural τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ occurs xxiv. 19, 27, and is frequent in Acts—xviii. 25, xxiii. 11, xxiv. 22, xxviii. 31—where it seems to be used especially of the doctrine of a crucified and risen Christ.[5] Here then we have an indication that the language is Lucan, a conjecture materially strengthened by the use of the stereotyped phrase τέλος ἔχει, a phrase used of oracles and predictions being accomplished.[6] In no other passage of the gospels is Jesus represented as quoting from the second Isaiah or applying to Himself the fate of the Servant, except in Lk. iv. 17ff. in connexion with the incident of His rejection at Nazareth, a passage which is peculiar to the third gospel. The connexion between Jesus and the Servant is twice insisted on by the writer of the first gospel—Mt. viii. 17, xii. 16 to 21—and the use of παῖς as a designation of the Christian Messiah is frequent in Acts. It is on the whole probable that the formulation of the "παῖς theology" is the work of the Hellenistic section of the community for whom the word παῖς, with its double meaning servant or son, would seem a peculiarly appropriate designation of one who combined in His own person the functions of lowly sufferer and Messianic king.

The supposition based on an examination of the text of the gospels, that the elaboration of the proof from scripture is the work not of the historical Jesus but of the community, may be further strengthened on grounds of psychology. Let us suppose, however, that Jesus made use of it, though only incidentally. With what purpose must He have done this? Clearly in order to justify His claim to Messiahship, either to Himself or others, whether friends or foes. The former hypothesis has only to be expressed to be rejected. Prophetic personalities—and Jesus belongs to this category, even though His consciousness in the last resort goes far

[5] *Cf.* also for the phrase τὰ περὶ used in a more general connexion, Acts i. 3, xxiii. 15, xxiv. 10, xxviii. 15, and Plummer, *St. Luke*, p. 506.

[6] Plummer, op. cit. *Cf.* Jn. xix. 30.

beyond it—need no such external supports. They stand or fall by the strength of their own inner conviction, holding unwaveringly to the truth of their message because the message is part of them and its truth self-evident, since it issues from the very depths of their being. But even with reference to others, this kind of support for His mission must have been impossible. For the proof from scripture, from its very nature, consists in nothing else than the systematic drawing of threads between the Old Testament and the details of the life of Jesus, in order to prove that the one was foreshadowed in the other. Such a proof, however, can only be adduced by a scribe, whose business it was "to collect and apply the oracles of the Old Testament in the light of the new dispensation" (Birkitt), who has before him both the Old Testament and the life of Jesus as complete wholes, and who is thus in a position to set them in relation to one another. It cannot be used by one who is actually living his life and standing within it. Not the least important indication of the essential difference between the synoptic and Johannine portraits of Jesus is to be found in the fact that the latter consistently represents Him as viewing His life from the standpoint of the fulfilment of definite prophecies. Even on the cross, and almost at the moment of death, Jesus allows Himself to be controlled by the interest of the proof from scripture. The "I thirst" is spoken only that the scripture might be fulfilled. And we shall not be wrong if we interpret the "It has been accomplished" as a sigh of relief that now the last scripture is fulfilled and the life on earth brought to a close. But while no real man behaves and thinks in this way, because no man views his own life so calmly and objectively, such a method would be natural enough for the theologian, accustomed from long practice to consider the life of Jesus from the standpoint of prophecy and fulfilment. In character the passages which have been passed in review above must be said to reflect this external and mechanical point of view. It is one thing to have a mind steeped in the spirit of the prophets, and quite another to use the scriptures only as a storehouse of theological weapons for the establishment of a definite claim. The former is alone credible in the case of Jesus. He would be no real man who should find the purpose and significance of his life in the effort to give fulfilment to the words of a sacred book. Such an aim would rob the life of all true reality, since its centre would lie outside the man himself. For precisely in the case of Jesus there is no question of a slavish dependence on scripture, which would be the necessary presupposition if He is supposed to have used it in support of His claim to Messiahship. He stands towards the Old Testament in the attitude of independent sovereignty, which is the mark of the religious genius. Though He does not belittle its treasures, He yet treats it authoritatively, testing its contents by the standard of His own judgment.

To suppose that Jesus required people to believe in Him on the ground that the details of His life corresponded exactly with the predictions of scripture, would be seriously to underrate the paramount greatness of His personality. As He came forward strong only in the certainty of His divine mission, a certainty which was His by virtue of the unique relationship in which He believed Himself to stand towards God, so He desired the recognition of His person on the part of others, solely on the ground of His own self-evident and transcendent greatness. He despised the faith which needed such external supports as miracles—Mt. xvi. 1 to 4—and the argument from fulfilled predictions would stand on the same level. Moreover, support of this kind, quite apart from the fact that it could not have been adduced without a minute study of the Old Testament, *ad hoc*, in conflict with the Scribes, would have been by no means without danger for Jesus Himself. For assuming that Jesus had really wished to find support for His claims in the circumstance that the events of His life were seen to be in accordance with Messianic predictions, if the attempt was to have any appearance of success, He must have made use only of such passages of the Old Testament as on the one hand were generally accepted as Messianic, and on the other presented a sufficient degree of correspondence with the events of His own life. Such a practice must have exposed Him to a double danger—either He would have followed this path systematically, and so have adjusted His character and actions increasingly to the picture of the Messiah,[7] as He or His contemporaries conceived it to have been presented by the prophets, with the inevitable loss of independence and freedom—or, when no longer able to dispense with this external support, He would have found Himself in a constant state of doubt and uncertainty about His vocation. So much is, at any rate, clear: the content of Jesus' Messianic consciousness is precisely in essentials totally different from the Messianic ideals of the Old Testament, at least as these were interpreted by the men of His age. Had Jesus been resolved to force His life into an unnatural conformity with Old Testament Messianic pictures, He must either have played a part, or have ultimately relinquished His claims to Messiahship. So external a guarantee as the proof from scripture can have had no significance for a personality like that of Jesus of Nazareth. Finally, he who, despite all arguments, desires still to maintain that Jesus made use of the proof from scripture in His own interest, stands before the following dilemma:—He must either adopt the position that the events which, for example, Lk. xviii. 31 to 33, justifies from scripture, were really found beforehand, predicted of the Messiah in the Old Testament, and that the passages employed to prove this

[7] A statement of the view that Jesus deliberately set Himself to fulfil prophecy in certain circumstances will be found in E. C. Selwyn, *The Oracles in the New Testament*, pp. 370 ff.

were really Messianic; or he must have the moral courage to declare that a historically false interpretation of Old Testament passages cannot justify real events. The old supernaturalism, which consistently regarded the Old Testament as Messianic, and found the whole significance of prophecy in its predictions of Jesus, can alone claim to be heard. It at least is a noble and consistent interpretation; but the man for whom the premises on which it rested are no longer valid, cannot escape the conclusion that the exercise of the proof from scripture is only to be understood from the standpoint of the community, for whom the life of Jesus was present as a complete whole, and whose views with regard to the Old Testament made possible, and even necessary, the employment of the proof from scripture as an apologetic weapon of the first importance.

This attempt to establish the psychological impossibility of the employment of this kind of proof on the part of Jesus may be open to criticism on more than one ground. It may be said that the materials in our possession scarcely warrant the drawing of such confident conclusions as to the nature of His personality. It may be said again that we are too modern in our conceptions of the character of Jesus, as in our estimates of His aims and ideals. Some may even affirm that the attempt to deny the use of the proof from scripture to the historical Jesus is due to a desire that He should escape the reproach of resorting to methods no longer regarded as valid. If with Schweitzer it be asserted that "the dogmatic element in the gospels is precisely the historical element"—because the gospels are saturated with eschatology, and "eschatology is simply dogmatic history, history as moulded by theological beliefs"—may it not be argued that what "no real man" would do, is precisely what must be expected of the Jesus whose mind was dominated by eschatological beliefs, and who purposed "to set in motion the eschatological development of history by the dynamic force of His own self-consciousness?" It is well that those who look with favour on the views of Schweitzer as tending to establish the trustworthy character of the gospel narratives should realise clearly the position to which their guide will lead them. The Jesus of Schweitzer—"this really historical Jesus, who with Messianic majesty tried to realise erroneous and antiquated hopes, can have no value for us." [8] A self-consciousness such as Schweitzer attributes to the historical Jesus, "will have an abnormal look about it. The next step—to assume psychic abnormality in Jesus—is then an easy one."[9] Of course if Schweitzer's picture were really historical, we should be bound in honesty to accept it, however distasteful; but the gospels, when critically examined, do not support Schweitzer's conclusions. The sources, as we have seen, point

[8] Loofs *What is the truth about Jesus Christ?*

[9] Loofs op. cit., p. 118.

to the view that the community, and not Jesus Himself, is responsible for the creation of the proof from scripture, so that "the dogmatic element" in this instance, is clearly secondary.

Moreover, it is possible to support further the contention that the elaboration of the proof from scripture must be attributed to the community. A clearly recognisable tradition makes it subsequent to the resurrection, dating it at a time when, as a result of the resurrection appearances, the circle of the disciples of Jesus had attained to new life and completeness. This tradition is clearly reflected in Lk. xxiv. Here the instruction of the disciples in the use of the proof from scripture is referred back to the risen Jesus—a situation sufficiently transparent!—who is represented as repeating the instruction already given in His life-time, but misunderstood by His disciples. We have here to do with a methodical "Bible Course," to use Holtzmann's telling phrase. The risen Christ goes through all the scriptures of the Old Testament, beginning from the Law, pointing to and explaining all the passages which refer to Himself. Here is reflected clearly enough a time when the proof from scripture had been already developed into an an art which sought its proofs systematically, in all the books of the Old Testament, in order to establish the position that "the Messiah" (so speaks significantly enough the risen Jesus in Lk. xxiv. 26) was destined to suffer just because it had been so predicted. The importance which this tradition had for Luke may be seen from the fact that he makes not only the apostles at Jerusalem receive this instruction, but also represents it as given to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus—in whom we may perhaps see the representatives of the Gentile mission. So much is at any rate certain—Gentile Christianity naturally took over, together with the Old Testament, the proof from scripture, and had the same interest in it as the primitive community.

A clear indication that the belief in the resurrection of Jesus was the occasion for the formulation of the proof from scripture by the community, is provided also by the fourth gospel. Here we read—ii. 22—that the disciples after the resurrection, by remembering words spoken by Jesus in His life-time, came to believe the testimony of scripture concerning Him. And even more clearly—xii. 16—after the triumphal entry has been represented as the fulfilment of prophecy, the writer asserts that "the disciples did not understand these things at the first, but after Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him." Here it is said quite definitely that the disciples saw in this event a fulfilment of prophecy only after the resurrection of Jesus. So, too, all possibility that instruction had been given to the disciples by Jesus before His death on the subject of the relation of

that death to prophecy, is excluded by the explanation given of the disciples' behaviour at the grave—"As yet they knew not the scripture that He must rise again from the dead" (Jno. xx. 9). Though in a manner less definite than in Lk., the tradition is present here also that the exercise of the proof from scripture is chronologically conditioned by the resurrection.

A third witness to the tradition that the proof from scripture emanated from the community, has been already cited incidentally. Justin—in reliance on Lk. ?—relates of the risen Lord that "He taught the disciples to read the prophecies in which all things were foretold as about to happen." (*Apology* i., c. 50), and in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (c. 106) we actually read that "the disciples, after the Lord had instructed them in this manner, and had expressly reminded them that in His life-time He had already said all these things to them, repented that they had forsaken Him."

The fact is not without significance that the proof from scripture is primarily concerned with the discovery of evidence for the passion and death of Jesus as in conformity with Old Testament predictions of the Messiah. The knowledge that His sufferings were foretold in scripture was the result of an entirely new reading of the Old Testament, at which the community, as it must have appeared, could not have arrived of itself. The discovery that the mysterious and unwelcome termination of the life of Jesus had been prophesied in the Old Testament, could naturally only have been made after the sad event had become a fact, and when, in addition, the resurrection appearances had raised the faith of the disciples into new life. Thus the Easter faith provides the historically necessary presupposition for the employment of the proof from scripture, and so far its attribution to the risen Jesus is not unjustifiable.

To sum up:—Q., the oldest and most reliable source for the teaching of Jesus, contains no hint, apart from one highly suspicious passage, that the proof from scripture was ever employed by Jesus, nor does the writer himself evince the least interest in it.

The synoptic gospels contain but nine passages in which the use of the proof from scripture is attributed to Jesus. The passages themselves are stereotyped and formal in character. They would have been useless apart from previous detailed instruction on the part of Jesus, which the sources shew to have been impossible. Only in two cases is a passage of the Old Testament actually cited.

Psychological arguments strengthen the position already arrived at. No real man can have deliberately arranged His life in order to bring it into unnatural conformity with supposed Messianic predictions. Such an attempt on the part of Jesus, if made, would have exposed Him to a double danger. The use of the proof from scripture presupposes a prolonged

training, undergone in the interest of apologetics, by one who could view both the Old Testament and the life of Jesus as complete wholes.

The attempt to retain the dogmatic element, in the supposed interests of orthodoxy, involves logically the supposition of "psychic abnormality" in the consciousness of Jesus.

Lk. xxiv., the fourth Gospel, and Justin, clearly reflect the tradition that the exercise of the proof from scripture dates from a period subsequent to the death and resurrection of Jesus.

NOTE.—The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness for much of the material in this paper to an article by Dr. Karl Weidel—*Uber den Einfluss des Weissagungsbeweises auf die evangelische Geschichte*, published in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1910.

THE SYNCRETIC CHRIST.

By Miss K. M. EMERY, M.A.

One of the greatest and most fascinating problems in the study of early Christology is to trace the development of thought by which Jesus of Nazareth became for the Church the Logos-Christ, the Second Person of a Triune Godhead. Dr. Rendel Harris, in his recent treatise on *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel*[1] has re-discovered or, at least, re-emphasised, one very important step in the process, viz., the intermediate indentification of Jesus with Sophia, the Wisdom of God.

By collating the three great "Praises of Wisdom" in the O.T. (Prov. viii. Sap. Sir. xxiv., and Sap. Sol. vii.) with the three most important Christological passages in the N.T. (Col. i. 15-20; Heb. i. 1-4; and St. John i. 1-18), Dr. Rendel Harris demonstrates that the phraseology of the passages in the N.T. is based on the Praises of Wisdom in the O.T.; the two latter of these being dependent on and expansions of the original Hymn in Prov. viii. He postulates the existence of an hypothetical intermediary Hymn to Wisdom; but this seems hardly necessary, for when Sophia and the Logos have once been identified, and Christ equated with both, as was certainly the case before St. John's Gospel was written, it seems just as easy to put

[1] *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel*, by Rendel Harris. Cambridge University Press, 1917.

Logos for Sophia immediately in phrases adapted from the O.T. Praises of Wisdom.

Dr. Rendel Harris traces the equation (Christ = Wisdom) through the Patristic writings back to a very early book of Scripture proofs, called the Testimony Book, which is found re-written in the works of Cyprian and other authors, and he claims to have proved (p. 64)

> "that the tradition of this Testimony Book is earlier than the New Testament, antedates the Gospels, is Apostolic in origin, and the common property of all early schools of Christian thought,"

and that

> "in accordance with the Testimony Book, as well as from several other lines of enquiry, it is clear that the first and foremost article of Christian belief is that Jesus is the Wisdom of God, personified, incarnate, and equated with every form of personification of Wisdom that could be derived from or suggested by the Scriptures of the Old Testament."

He even considers that the statement "Jesus is the Wisdom of God," preceded the statement "Jesus is the Christ."

All readers of his treatise will agree that Dr. Rendel Harris has fully proved the early existence of a Testimony Book, which opened with the identification of Christ with Sophia (in the form in which the Book appears in Cyprian), and the use in this identification from the earliest times of all the technical Sapiential terms. But I believe it can be shewn that his conclusions, as quoted above, need some modification.

It would take too long to describe here how all the Sapiential expressions and images were in turn applied to Jesus Christ: the simple enumeration of some of them will suffice to recall the Scriptural passages in which they occur, *e.g.*, Beginning,[2] First-Begotten,[3] Only-Begotten,[4] *Assessor Dei*,[5] Life,[6] Light,,[7] Effulgence, Radiance, Reflection,[8] Mirror,[9] Image,[10] Tabernacled,[11] Fulness,[12] Seal.[13]

---

[2] ἀρχή Prov. viii. 22 (Sept.), John i. 1, cf. Col. i. 18.

[3] πρωτότοκος Sap. Sir. xxiv. 3 (Vulg.), Heb. i. 6; Prov. viii. 25, Col. i. 18.

[4] μονογενής Sap. Sol. vii. 22, John i. 14, 18.

[5] πάρεδρος, πρὸς τὸν θεόν Prov. viii. 27, John i. 1-2; Sap. Sol. ix. 4, 9, 10.

[6] ζωή Prov. viii. 35; iii. 18, John i. 2, and *passim*.

[7] φώς Sap. Sol. vii. 29, John i. 9, and *passim*; 2 Cor. iv. 6.

[8] ἀπαύγασμα Sap. Sol. vii. 26, Heb. i. 3.

[9] ἔσοπτρον Sap. Sol. vii. 26, 2 Cor. iv. 6; iii. 18, Odes Sol. xiii.

[10] εἴκων Sap. Sol. vii. 26, 2 Cor. iv. 6, Col. i. 15. cf. Phil. ii. 6.

[11] ἐσκήνωσεν Sap. Sir. xxiv. 4-12, John i. 14.

[12] πλήρωμα Philo (of Logos), Col. i. 19. (Generally explained as "Fulness of the Divine attributes," Rendel Harris explains it as originally of "The Law," in Christ "of Grace.")

[13] χαρακτήρ Philo (of Logos), Heb. i 3. cf. Eph i. 13.

Dr. Rendel Harris collates the Prologue of St. John (i. 1-18) phrase by phrase with the O.T. Praises of Wisdom, and attempts to restore the hypothetical older form, replacing Word by Wisdom in each phrase and giving references. The usefulness of these references is much impaired by many misprints in chapter or verse (p. 43).

One very important result of these investigations is the elucidation of the puzzling relationship between the Logos-Christ and the Holy Spirit in the later doctrine of the Trinity. The Wisdom of God and the Word of God are shewn to be parallel and synonymous in the O.T., and the Patristic writers equated Christ with each in turn, though here also "Wisdom hath the primacy." Again, Wisdom is equated with the Spirit of God. Though the O.T. references for this are somewhat vague, the Patristic ones are decisive. Theophilus of Antioch, in referring to the Creation, quotes Ps. xxxvi. 6, thus: "God by His Word and His Wisdom made all things, for by His Word were the Heavens made, and all their host by His Spirit." The Testimony Book recognises Wisdom as the Creative Hand of God, quoting Is. lxvi. 2, and xli. 20. The Clementine Homilies and Irenaeus proceed to explain the Word and Wisdom as the two Hands of God, and Irenaeus further equates them with the Son and the Spirit. So the formula Christ = Logos = Sophia (Wisdom) = Spirit was obtained (though never so baldly stated) and by dividing it into two equal halves, the Logos—Christ and the Sophia—Spirit, the doctrine of the Trinity emerges (p. 22), the primary doctrine of belief in God the Father having always been undisputed. A statement of the practical reasons for this division does not come within the scope of Dr. Rendel Harris' treatise, but may be partly deduced therefrom, as will appear later.

Dr. Rendel Harris considers that the identification of Jesus with Wisdom is pre-Pauline as well as pre-Johannine, and the first article of Christian belief (p. 62). But can we imagine any of the Twelve originating such a theory? And the arguments adduced to shew that Jesus Himself might have identified Himself with Sophia do not carry conviction to the reader (pp. 57-62).

Dr. Rendel Harris hardly seems to make enough allowance for the existence of a previous doctrine of the Spirit, parallel to that of Wisdom and the Word (are not these three all one?) both in Judaism and also in the very earliest Christian preaching. The Spirit is expressly mentioned in the O.T. as that Power of God which inspires wisdom in men (Is. lxi. 2; Joel ii. 28; Ez. xxxix. 29; Hag. ii. 5; Ps. li. 11; cxxxix. 7; cxliii. 10).

In the N.T. the Spirit, or the Holy Spirit, is recognised from the beginning as the "Inspirer" of Jesus Himself (Luke iv. 1 and 14; vii. 18 to 23), and of all who believe on Christ (on almost every page of the Acts and

Epistles, and notably in the account of the day of Pentecost). Dr. ndel Harris says (p. 49):—

"When the Logos becomes also (besides Sophia) an *Assessor Dei*, we have the Christian Trinity, but behind this there is the earlier stratum of a Christian Duality, the Holy Spirit being not yet come in a theological sense, because the Divine Wisdom was not yet divided into Logos and Pneuma."

It is true that the metaphysical doctrine of the Trinity had not yet been olved, but in the earliest preaching of the Apostles we do find three tinct figures:—

(1) God, Jehovah, the Transcendent Deity, the Father.
(2) The Holy Spirit, the agent of God's influence in the minds of men.
(3) Jesus, the Christ-Messiah, the crucified and risen Saviour, the future Judge of men.

It was only after the proposition "Jesus is the Messianic Son of God" the theocratic sense) became "Jesus is the Logos-Son of God" (in the etaphysical sense) that a doctrine of the triune nature of the Deity became ssible, and then it was inevitable.

Can we discover when and where the identification of Jesus the Christ th the Sophia-Logos first occurred? I believe we can. Careful study of e Acts and of the earlier Epistles of St. Paul (1 and 2 Thess. and Gal.) veals no hint of any preaching of Wisdom, or of the Sapiential vocabulary, t proves conclusively that up to the time of St. Paul's two years sojourn Ephesus, he and the Twelve preached Jesus only as the crucified and en Servant of Jehovah (*παῖς*, cf. Is. lii. 13 in lxx.) the Holy and Righteous ne, the Messiah or Christ, the Saviour and future Judge of men, the eavenly Son of Man of the Similitudes of Eth. Enoch, whose coming ain in the clouds of heaven was daily expected, whom Stephen had seen nding at the right hand of God, and whom Paul had proclaimed at mascus, immediately after His conversion, as the Son of God (Acts ix. 20 ems to refer to the earliest use of this title, which does not occur before).

The Apostles also taught of a Divine Power, whom they called the oly Spirit, or simply the Spirit, which was working in the believers, giving em power by words and signs to convert the world to repentance and to are their own joyous faith and hope in Christ. Even in Athens, the city the Goddess of Wisdom, where, if anywhere, it might have seemed ective to preach the doctrine of the Incarnate Logos-Sophia, St. Paul nfined himself to proclaiming Jesus as "the Man whom God hath dained, through whom He will judge the world in righteousness, whereof e hath given an assurance unto all men in that He hath raised Him from e dead."

Not very long after St. Paul's first visit to Athens and to Corinth, a new influence entered the life of the Church and of Paul himself. While Paul was away on a visit to Jerusalem, a learned Alexandrian Jewish Teacher, a disciple of John the Baptist, came to Ephesus and there made the acquaintance of Priscilla and her husband Aquila, who instructed him in the fuller truths of the Gospel of Christ as taught by their friend and comrade St. Paul.

Apollos combined his new knowledge of Jesus the Christ with his former body of doctrine learned at Alexandria, in which the Jewish philosophy of the Wisdom of God had already entered into combination with the Greek philosophy of the Logos: the doctrine of which Philo had been a recent and enthusiastic exponent (20—40 A.D.)[14] Apollos soon proceeded to Corinth where he continued the work so successfully begun by Paul shortly before, powerfully confuting the Jews in public discussion, and proving by the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ (Acts xviii. 28), building in his own method on the foundation Paul had laid.

After Paul returned to Ephesus from Syria, Apollos also returned thither from Corinth, and the two great teachers met. We should expect the friendship and intercourse which they then enjoyed to have a profound influence on the development of Christian philosophy, which in that period was necessarily concerned with Christology, and we find our anticipation justified.

Some writers think that Apollos first introduced St. Paul to the Book of Wisdom, which is variously dated from 150 to 1 B.C. by different commentators. But supposing St. Paul had been acquainted with the book before, as his evident intimacy with the Septuagint makes probable if the Book was already incorporated into the Greek Scriptures, his use of the Sophia-Logos teaching seems to date from the time of his meeting with Apollos, as is shewn by the negative result of our search for Wisdom up to this point. We may fairly conjecture that the two later Wisdom Books, Sap. Sir. and Sap. Sol. were better known and appreciated in their Greek form, and in Alexandria where they were preserved and incorporated into the Greek version of the O.T., than in their Hebrew or Aramaic form, in which they never found a place in the Jewish Bible.

We may feel confident that Paul and Apollos had many long and interesting discussions on the nature and work of Christ, and searched the Scriptures and their own brains for "proofs" of the kind beloved by Rabbis and Alexandrians alike, the learning and knowledge of the one supplementing or corroborating those of the other; and it seems to me not at all improbable that they were the joint authors of that very Testimony Book on which Dr

[14] *The Development of the Logos Doctrine in Greek and Hebrew Thought*, by the Rev. F. E. Walton B.D. Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1911.

ıdel Harris lays such stress. No teachers could have been more ıpetent to render this service to the Church.

The influence of Apollos and the Wisdom lore is visible in the very iest chapters of 1 Corinthians, where the word "wisdom" is played on in ıy keys, and the wisdom of God as taught by the Holy Spirit (not self Wisdom) and epitomised in "Jesus Christ crucified" is contrasted ı the wisdom of the Greek philosophers and Judaisers. The Spirit is e, as elsewhere in St. Paul's Epistles, parallel to some aspects of Wisdom, the special sapiential phraseology does not yet appear, and St. Paul ıtifies Christ with Wisdom only incidentally and, as it were, tentatively, sdom in 1 Cor. i. 30 being on the same footing with Righteousness and ctification, which never were hypostatised or even personified. 1 Cor. i. ns to imply that Paul had not yet thoroughly absorbed the new identifi- on and made it his own; while 1 Cor. ii. and iii. indicate not obscurely he was not quite certain that the superstructure of doctrine erected by llos on his own "firm foundation" of "Jesus Christ crucified" will stand test of time, though he obviously hopes and even believes it will, or he ld not in 1 Cor. xvi. 12 express the desire that Apollos should accept the tation to return to Corinth to continue the instruction of his own best ved but most troublesome and unstable converts. We may opine that llos was unwilling to go because he did not wish to leave Ephesus while l was there.

Continuing our search for traces of the influence of the Wisdom ature in the N.T., we find several ideas adopted and adapted from Sap. in the rest of 1 Cor., and still more in 2 Cor. and Romans, as set forth ngth by H. St. John Thackeray in *St. Paul and Jewish Thought*;[15] and by time the Epistle to the Colossians was written St. Paul had entirely milated sapiential imagery and uses the full sapiential vocabulary with and freedom.

It is worthy of notice that after St. Paul had identified Christ with the hia-Logos, the expressions "the Spirit of God" and the "Spirit of st," and also "the Lord" and "the Spirit," are hardly, if at all, nguishable in his usage, and are once or twice definitely identified or. iii. 17-18, and Rom. viii. 9). In 2 Cor. iii. 18 and vi. 6, the beautiful characteristic sapiential image of the Mirror is employed, as if familiar. ıpare—Sap. Sol. vii. 25-26—"Wisdom is the effluence of the glory of and the Mirror of the Divine activity" with "the light of the knowledge ıe glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" and "we all beholding as in rror the glory of the Lord are transformed into the same image from y to glory, as from the Lord the Spirit."

[15] *St. Paul and Jewish Thought*, by H. St. John Thackeray, M.A. Macmillan & Co., 1900.

The use of the symbol of the Mirror by St. Paul may well be compared with its use in Ode 13 of the *Odes of Solomon*,[16] quoted at the end of this paper where the Lord is the Mirror in which believers see the image of the ideal man, and are encouraged to strive to grow into His likeness. This Ode therefore upholds the marginal translation of the rare word κατοπτριζόμενοι which agrees with its use elsewhere (see Liddell and Scott).

We must now leave St. Paul and trace the Christus-Sophia-Logos doctrine through the writings of his successors.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, whether Apollos himself in later years, about 69 A.D., or one of his pupils at Alexandria or Ephesus employs not only the full Sapiential vocabulary of the O.T. Praises of Wisdom, but also the extra terms and ideas applied by Philo to the Logos *viz.*, χαρακτήρ, seal or image; ἀρχιερεύς, High Priest; υἱὸς θεοῦ, Son of God; ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, the ideal man.

The author of the Apocalypse, possibly written in the reign of Domitian, *i.e.*, between 70 and 80 A.D., applies the actual title "Word of God" to the Christ triumphant in the millenial kingdom (Rev. xix. 13).

The Epistles and Gospel of St. John, whether written by himself in old age or by his disciples, were certainly the product of the Ephesian school of theology, founded by Paul and Apollos, and in them the ideas and images familiar in the Wisdom literature frequently occur. We may cite especially the symbolic use of Life, Light, Truth, Way, and the Vine. The Gospel may be looked upon as illustrating the work of the Sophia-Logos by the words and acts of Jesus. One characteristic of the Wisdom literature is noteworthy in both the Gospel and the first Epistle of St. John, the clear-cut division of mankind into the children of light and the children of darkness, *viz.*, those who receive the Sophia-Logos and those who reject him (or her). This feature of St. John's Gospel, which is absent from the Synoptics, was emphasised by Mr. C. G. Montefiore in an early essay.[17]

The writer of the *Odes of Solomon*, so happily discovered and ably translated and edited by Dr. Rendel Harris, and expounded by subsequent commentators, and dated variously 90—180 A.D., loves to expatiate on the Word, identified with the Thought of God, and refers to it as the Beginning, the Agent of creation, Life and Light.[18]

In Ode 13 the Perfect Virgin, Preacher of Grace, is apparently identified with the Saviour-Judge, and the reference to Christ as the Mirror in Ode 13 has already been noticed. It is clear therefore that the equation

[16] *An Early Christian Psalter*, by Rendel Harris (J. Nisbet & Co.), and *The Prologue*, pp. 39 and 53.

[17] *The Jewish Quarterly*, about 1902.

[18] *The Odes of Solomon*, Two Cambridge Lectures, by J. H. Bernard, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, p. 13. S.P.C.K., 1913.

rist = Sophia = Logos had been accepted and assimilated by Syrian as ll as Greek Christians by the end of the first or the middle of the second ntury.

In the Patristic writers, as Dr. Rendel Harris proves by numerous otations, the quadruple equation Christus = Logos = Sophia = Spirit was ided in different ways; but the first and last terms seem never to have en fully equated by theologians though the identification of them is rceptible in St. Paul's thought and a few expressions, as already remarked. entually the equation was divided into two equal parts, Christus-Logos, d Sophia-Spirit, which were henceforth kept distinct in theological eculation, though practical preachers in every age find it hard to distinguish tween the functions of the Logos and the Spirit, either in creation or piration. The inevitableness of the theological division may be deduced m several considerations.

The original Christian teaching of the Father, Christ, and the Holy irit, as described above, and crystallised in the familiar Grace of 2 Cor. i. 14, and in the fully developed Baptismal formula, made it imperative to ep the three Persons distinct.

The need to retain the sense of Jesus Christ's human personality, as own on earth and ascended up into heaven, made it difficult for unmystical nds to identify Him with Sophia, the inner Wisdom (*σοφία*) Thought, telligence (*νοῦς*) of God, the Indwelling Word (*λογος ἐνδιάθετος*) ough it was more possible to look upon Him as the Uttered Word *όγος προφορικός*) and as such the incarnate revelation of God's will and nd.

Again, the difference of gender must have had some effect. The mere mmatical distinctions in pronouns and agreements tended to separate the ristus-Logos, who was certainly masculine when incarnate in Jesus of zareth, Son of God and Son of Man, from the Sophia-Spirit; for Sophia Wisdom is feminine in all the languages used by early theologians, and irit is also feminine in Hebrew and Syriac, though neuter in Greek. The nder of Sophia-Spirit undoubtedly had influence on the historical and losophical imagination in Eastern Christianity as well as in Gnosticism, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as cited by Origen and St. ome, Christ speaks of "My Mother the Holy Spirit,"[19] and in the beautiful *mn of the Soul* by Bardaisan,[20] the letter from the King of Kings to his ndering and forgetful son begins:—

"From Thy Father, the King of Kings, from the Queen thy Mother,
And from thy Brother, to thee, our son in Egypt, be greeting."

Rendel Harris, *Prologue*, p. 48.

Translated into English verse by Prof. F. C. Burkitt in his *St. Margaret's Lectures on Early Christianity*.

Philo had written of Sophia as "the Divine Conjugate," the Mother of the Kosmos (here identified with the Logos).[21] Sometimes, however, Sophia appears as the daughter of God, a term which is implied in μονογενής and πρωτοτοκός, which are both feminine as well as masculine adjectival forms. The *Pistis Sophia* (an early Gnostic writing) refers to the twinship of Jesus and the Holy Spirit, as identified with the Logos and Sophia respectively; the imagery of the two hands of God contributed to this view.

To us in this 20th century, all these old metaphysical speculations seem to deal with abstractions and unrealities, or personification carried to excess and the so-called Scripture proofs to be often the result of the literal interpretation of poetical language by unpoetical minds, and to be either misapplications or mere verbal jugglery, ingenious and historically interesting but not convincing. However, for the sake of continuity and the heritage of the past, we still try to think of the One God as a Trinity, or under three aspects; whether as Power, Love, and Wisdom, with St. Augustine, or as God Transcendent, God Immanent, and God in Thought; or more usually and simply as God, Father, Saviour, and Inspirer. As Inspirer we call Him by different names:—the Logos, or the Living and Indwelling Christ,[22] or the Holy Spirit, or even Mr. H. G. Wells' "Invisible King," but we all mean the same thing, it is the function not the name which matters. And many of us best realise the human character of Jesus, portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels, as the highest exponent to humanity of the moral nature and love of God, and also of God's ideal for Man. So that Jesus is still for us as for St. Paul and the author of the *Odes of Solomon*, the Mirror, which reflects the Image of God, and also the Image of Man as God would have him be.

> "Behold the Lord is our Mirror; open the eyes and see them in Him; and learn the manner of your face; and tell forth praises to His Spirit; and wipe off the filth from your face; and love His holiness and clothe yourselves therewith; and be without stain at all times before Him. Hallelujah."[23]

---

[21] Rendel Harris, *Prologue*, p. 51.

[22] See *Modern Churchman*, December, 1915, p. 496, on "A Quaker's Apologia."

[23] Ode 13 in *An Early Christian Psalter*, Rendel Harris.

FACING THE FACTS.*

These three books while differing in method, outlook, and subject atter have this in common—that they face the facts. In such works, this a rare merit. The power of convention is still so strong in the religious orld that nothing is so much resented as the bare suggestion that the state id prospects of the Church are unsatisfactory. The *Church Times* attacks r. Matthews with characteristic virulence for expressing the opinion that e intellectual equipment of the present generation of clergy leaves some- ing to be desired.

"Large numbers hardly ever open any book but the Bible, some strictly orthodox commentary thereon, and such little books as are published every Lent with episcopal commendations. They confess with the utmost frankness that they 'have no time to read.' If ever they do read a book, they judge it by the standard acquired during a year's residence at a Theological College, perhaps twenty or thirty years ago. They ask instinctively not, 'Is this true?' but, 'Is this orthodox?'[1]

Whether this is a good or a bad thing is matter of opinion. But that it is is matter of fact, not of opinion. And, as the training of the Theological ollege, or Seminary, takes the place of that of the University, this failure the parochial clergy to read or think increases. The Church is falling ore and more into line with pietism of a narrow ecclesiastical type; and ore and more out of touch with the intelligence of the community. So at the religious situation of the Latin countries is being reproduced ong us; for

"We live in a world which cannot believe that any teaching is to be accepted simply on the authority of a professional clerical caste, less educated, less cultivated, less accustomed to face the facts of life than the best representatives of lay professions, or even in many cases than the most thoughtful artisans."[2]

The value of "Providence and Faith" is that it gives us "a reasonable ctrine of God to meet our urgent need." It reminds us, accordingly, that e belief in God is "a dangerous belief;" because it is more important to lieve in His character than in His existence; and because it is possible to lieve in a very evil God. The German divines, quoted in *Hurrah and llelujah*, are no doubt sincere in their belief in their national deity; but s German God—*von Gott*, as He has been called—is no more an ethical inity than Chemosh. And other than German theologians may be

---

ovidence and Faith. William Scott Palmer, with an introductory Essay by C. H. S. Matthews. Macmillan, 1917, 2/6.

oughts on Religion at the Front. Rev. Neville S. Talbot, Assistant Chaplain General. Macmillan, 1917, 2/-.

ers from Picardy. Rev. T. W. Pym, C.F.; Rev. Geoffrey Gordon, C.F. Constable & Co. 4/6.

[1] *Providence and Faith*, p. xi. [2] *Providence and Faith*, p. xxvi.

reminded that it is as important to credit God with the intellectual virtues as with the moral.

It would be difficult to speak too highly of Mr. Talbot's *Thoughts on Religion at the Front.* The writer's candour is great, his outlook large, his temper somewhat austere. With the religion which expresses the craving for security he has little sympathy.

> "Religion regarded *merely* as a resort in trouble, as a possible source of good luck, as a charm or insurance policy, is as old as man; but I believe many of the best soldiers up and down history have had little to do with it, and the more sporting and soldierly the man, the less he has had to do with it. After all, the soldier-man's code goes clean the other way." (p. 13).

It is true. Yet when we read, a little later, that "religion as taught by the Church of England has a feeble grip on the masses;" that, "if reasons are sought, they are partly found in the want of cutting edge to her sober comprehensive teaching, partly in the characteristics, often theoretically justifiable, but practically so awkward, of the Prayer Book;" that "there is little in our Church which corresponds to that elemental regimen or discipline which possesses simple minded Roman Catholics;" and that "the power of cultus, of institutional and family religion is largely absent," (pp. 17, 18) we ask ourselves whether this power of Catholicism is not mainly due to the very qualities which Mr. Talbot criticizes, not without reason, in men of another creed? For a glance at a Catholic manual of devotion shews that the vivid sense of the supernatural which the Church brings home to the masses is based on these self-regarding motives; and that it has been paid for at a price which may seem prohibitive—*i.e.*, the lowering of religion to their level; the result being that in proportion as they rise above this level, religion is left behind. Perhaps the solution is that you cannot have it both ways; and that one has to be satisfied at times with something short of the best.

Inevitable as this may be, a religion which habitually relies on lower motives will fail to appeal to higher. This, perhaps, is what Mr. Talbot means when he says that he does not think "that Christianity, as at present explained and presented to men in the Church (in the widest sense of the word) is *prima facie* that which can win and possess them." Certain survivals of "natural religion" have disguised and overlaid "those specifically Christian elements which make Christianity not only a salvation from sin and from hell, but from the morbid and even contemptible in religion . . . It is not a question of clear separation and abstraction, but of distinction, emphasis, and proportion. I believe that things not characteristically Christian have acquired a disproportionate place in our religion as handed down to us." (pp. 30-32). The fine lines quoted on pp. 75-77 emphasize this, laying as they do a Stevensonian stress on the adventure of religion and the leadership of Christ. He has no use for those who refuse this divine adventure:—

> "Our cheerful General on high
> With careless looks may pass you by."

"*On the whole* I venture to say," Mr. Talbot tells us, "that there is not a great revival of religion at the front." The authors of *Papers from Picardy* are of the same opinion, and express it even more decidedly. The men are splendid;" but

> "from a generalisation which is concerned with the basis of the character of the majority, conscious Christianity, however regretfully, must be left almost entirely out of account." (p. 184).

Convention and association assert themselves on occasions:—

> "There is no doubt that in the moment of danger the great majority of men pray. But for myself (says Mr. Gordon) I have no great admiration for this emergency religion of the trenches. It is based on fear, and fear is a rapidly shifting foundation. Such a religion, strong in the front line, is apt to grow weaker in support, almost to evaporate in billets, and to vanish altogether on a week's leave. A generation ago, preachers used to seek to cow their hearers into virtue by lurid emphasis upon the terrors of hell. Fear may, of course, sometimes be the first motive, turning a man away from vice and towards God, and as such it has its value. But I cannot believe that a religion in which fear plays a large part can be very acceptable to God, whether that fear be the fear of hell or the fear of shells." (p. 187).

And if we would estimate the future we must lift up our eyes to the hills.

> "What are the prospects for the future religion of England? If we are to judge by the churchgoing and professed Christianity of the army, none but a blind and wilful optimist can deny that the prospects are gloomy in the extreme. If, however, we shift our emphasis a little, and try to leave behind any preconceived ideas, we see in the manhood of England a character which we all admire, and which, in spite of all gaps and faults, moves many of us professing Christians to penitence and shame. This character has grown from four foundations: Belief in God; the sense of serving a great cause; the discipline of the Army; the brotherhood of soldiering. The Christian, when he realises that all these four foundation things find their crown and completion only in Christ, will, if he be a man of long sight, be both glad and hopeful." (p. 221).

No one can speak as these writers have spoken without risk of misunderstanding, and certainty of giving offence. "I hate him; for he doth not prophecy good concerning me, but evil." And the key to the situation is psychological—I had almost written pathological. No revival of religion can be expected under the circumstances in which we find ourselves. The war has produced an acute tension and overstrain. Combatants and non-combatants alike, we are living at so high a pressure that our nerves have been thrown off their balance, the equilibrium of life has been disturbed. Hence an epidemic of excess in all directions, normal and abnormal—drink, drugs, sex, divorce, speculation; everything is seen out of proportion:—the result being the mental and moral chaos the record of which we read in the divorce and police courts, and which any man of the world who knows the conditions could have foreseen. People talk of the problems of the after war

period. Such talk is premature. Before these problems can be even approached, much less formulated, the lost balance must be restored.

The prophets who prophecy smooth things—and they are always the prophets most in fashion—tell us that we are on the eve of a revival of religion. There are no signs of this; and we may be thankful that there are not. For what religious revival could shape itself out of the tangled skein of confusion, mental, moral, and material, in which we are involved? Religion is neither an emotional crisis, nor a political construction: and, as things are, even these substitutes are excluded. Belief has been subjected to a strain under which it is nearly at breaking point. The teaching of our Churches and Schools is still such as to make the secularist criticism colourable; and over and above this, is what gives it weight and point—the moral argument, which the experience of the war has emphasized: the unreason of the universe; its apparent indifference to rational and moral ends.

As long as we see the world and its mixed content as an aggregate of separate and invariable quantities, criticism of this sort is unanswerable. Isolate and fix the facts;—and they remain meaningless and repulsive; they lie like a foreign body in thought, and the more you face them the more foreign they appear. But look at them as moving points in a progression, as moments on an upward curve; and the perspective is changed. The element of time-and-place stuff falls from them. An advance along the whole line is perceptible; though it is slower and less uninterrupted than we could desire. The Ionian philosopher who, more perhaps than any other early teacher, anticipated the trend of modern thinking, conceived the universe as an all-embracing, never resting and never ending process: all things were in movement; you could not bathe twice in the same stream. No, nor once: the waters are ever changing; they touch you, pass, and are gone. And he took fire as the symbol of this eternal flux and flow of things; because fire is quick, and mobile; it "continueth not in one stay."

What may be said of the varying fortunes of mankind may be said of those of religion; in each case these fortunes are moments, or moving points, in a process as yet unrealized. There was a time, *e.g.*, when it would have been impossible to conceive religion without sacrifice—yet the word came, "Sacrifice thou wouldest not;" without a mediating priesthood—yet the One Mediatorship was brought home to the Christian consciousness; without the traditional sanctities of the Mediaeval Church—yet the call came to worship neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem; without the verbally inspired record of Scripture—yet we have learned that the letter killeth: we read in spirit and interpret in truth. In such instances—and how many more could be quoted!—religion survived its form and semblance: "the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed." Whether the coming conditions of society will develop an institutional religion; and, if so, what its institutions will be, it is impossible to say. But we shall be making a very great mistake if we buoy ourselves up with the hope of the restoration of institutional religion as former generations have known it. This is to expect the clock to go back: which it has never done, and will never do.

What is important is that, as this religion declines or disappears, its place shall be taken by something which, if, relatively at least, uninstitutional, is still a religion. Unless this be so, the fire is not vital, but destructive; the bush will be consumed. And what is most significant in our churches is not so much their emptiness as the absence of any religious equivalent for the functions which they formerly discharged. "Where there is no vision, the people perish." No excellence on the practical side of life, ethical as such excellencies often are, can supply for the failure to see God. And, if this be so with those in whom the moral virtues are conspicuous, what must be said of those who do not so much live as vegetate through life, untouched by its issues, unstirred by its achievements, unmoved by its pains? When a population stands outside ideas, outside emotions, outside the larger humanities of life with their redeeming sins and their saving virtues, what future can it look forward to? Not so much penalty, as extinction. There is nothing to catch fire; nothing to feed combustion; no bush either to burn or to be consumed.

ALFRED FAWKES.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE PROGRESS OF LITURGICAL REFORM IN THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

SIR, TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

As you have done me the honour of asking me to contribute a letter on the above subject to the *Modern Churchman*, I cannot but endeavour to comply with your request to the best of my ability.

Before recounting the chief liturgical reforms which have become law in the Church of Ireland as the result of the present Revision, it may be well to indicate the chief reforms introduced in the last Revision soon after Disestablishment.

The chief of these was the removal of the Rubric referring to the Athanasian Creed, thus making it unlawful to say or sing it in the services of the Church. A Resolution had passed the General Synod removing the damnatory clauses, but when reported to the Diocesan Synods it was objected to by some of them, and so was not embodied in a Bill. As a compromise the Creed was retained in the Prayer Book unchanged, but with no Rubric before it. I think we may be glad of this on account of its being the one Creed which most clearly declares the Unity of God and, so, inferentially protests against anything of the nature of theories of substitution in the doctrine of the Atonement.

Another reform was the insertion of the following Question and Answer in the Church Catechism. *Question:* "After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper?" *Answer:* "Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the means whereby they are taken and received is Faith."

Another was the substitution, for the Rubric at the end of the Order of Confirmation, of the following Rubric: "Every person ought to present

himself for Confirmation [unless prevented by some urgent reason] before he partakes of the Lord's Supper."

Another was the substitution for the form of Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick of the form in the Communion Service.

An improvement introduced at the same time was the insertion, among collects to be said after the offertory, of part of the prayer in the Burial service beginning "Almighty God, with Whom do live," omitting the words after "Lord" up to "fear," and substituting "we humbly beseech" for "beseeching." We thus can have a commemoration of the departed at every service, though it is much to be regretted that it is not of the more outspoken character of a prayer for them such as was advocated by you, sir, in the *Modern Churchman* for June, and also that the bereaved who most need our prayers at such a time are omitted.

Now to pass to the chief gains of the Revision now in progress, and first those that have already become law. To my mind the most important of these is the provision of alternative Psalms for use at Evening Prayer on Good Friday, &c., Psalms xxiii. xxxi. and cxxx.

Thus the clergy are delivered from the obligation of taking part in the recital on the Day when we celebrate the consummation of the sacrifice of Him who came to save men from sin, and to teach them to be partakers of God's righteousness, of a Psalm which contains the expression of the wish: "Let them fall from one wickedness to another, and not come into Thy righteousness."

An amendment which aimed at making the alternative Psalms the only Proper Psalms at Evening Prayer on Good Friday, thus saving congregations from the possibility of having Psalm lxix. inflicted upon them by a perverse clergyman, was declared by the Assessor to be out of order, but the opinion was expressed to the mover by a very high authority that no clergyman would henceforth read that Psalm on Good Friday.

Next in importance is the measure by which certain selections of Psalms may be used, with the consent of the Ordinary, when Proper Psalms are not appointed, instead of the Psalms for the Day. This, of course, affords a way of escape from the recitation of the imprecatory Psalms.

After the Prayer for Fair Weather the following has been inserted. Or this:

> O Almighty Lord God, our heavenly Father: Look, we beseech Thee, in Thy loving kindness upon us Thine unworthy servants, and grant us such weather as may relieve our present distress, to our comfort and to the glory of thy holy Name: through Jesus Christ our Mediator and Advocate. *Amen.*

To the best of my recollection when the House was in committee on the Bill appointing this prayer we were given to understand that the words "Or this" made it alternative to the Prayer for Rain also.

Two additional Feasts have been inserted in the Calendar, St. Patrick and The Transfiguration, and Lessons have been appointed for them. The Resolutions embodying Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for these Days were referred back to the P.B. Committee this year.

Proper Psalms have been appointed for 1st Sunday in Advent, Christmas Eve, 1st Day of January, Epiphany, Easter Eve, Trinity Sunday, St. Michael, All Saints.

The Exhortation may be shortened, or may be omitted, and the following substituted: Let us humbly confess our sins to Almighty God; but for abbreviation or omission on Sunday the consent of the Ordinary is necessary.

Alterations have been introduced into the Confirmation and Marriage Services, and into that for the Consecration of a Churchyard or other Burial Ground, and a Form of Service has been provided for the Public Institution of a Minister to a Cure; and an order for Morning Service to be used on the First Sunday on which a Minister officiates in the Church of a Cure to which he has been instituted.

The Revision is still continuing, a number of Resolutions were passed this year, and will probably be embodied in Bills next year, when, doubtless, further Resolutions will be moved.

The terms of reference expressly exclude "any changes in Doctrine or in the Ritual Canons, which are now the Church's law," and so the present Revision cannot be of the radical nature some of us might desire.

The Revised Lectionary has not yet become law, and is itself in process of revision. The most important change suggested by the Committee to be made in the Lectionary is the removal, from the Lessons for Trinity Sunday, of Genesis xviii., with its tritheistic suggestion when used on that Day. It is much to be hoped, however, that the chapter may be re-introduced for reading on some other Sunday, so that the words: "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" may not be lost from our services.

Rubane House,
Kircubbin, Co. Down.

H. S. VERSCHOYLE.

REPRISALS.

SIR,

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

As a member of the Churchmen's Union I feel bound to protest strongly against the teaching on Reprisals published in the last issue of the *Modern Churchman*. I thought the Union stood for the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit. Are we to return to the Old Testament standard, and even that not at its highest?

To plead for the excision of the cursing psalms, but to hold the spirit of them seems a deplorable inconsistency. I would suggest these queries for consideration, for there seems not only a lack of Christianity in the advocacy of reprisals, but also a confusion of thought—does it not indeed invariably happen that where the first is not, there is certain to be the second?

(1) What happens to the theory that "to give a man what is due to him is to give him what is best for him," when confronted by our Lord's conduct to (*a*) The woman taken in adultery, (*b*) The thief upon the Cross, (*c*) St. Peter after his denial; or His teaching as found in (*a*) The parable of the Prodigal Son, (*b*) The Lost Sheep, (*c*) The Labourers in the Vineyard?

(2) Who is responsible for the raids over London? Surely the German Higher Command.

(3) Who is to suffer for these raids if we punish with reprisals? The German child.

(4) Suppose our raids effect their presumed purpose, *i.e.*, create great consternation amongst the civilian population and consequent pressure upon the German Higher Command. What will the effect be? Cessation of raids or promises of more effective and more frequent expeditions? There is little doubt as regards the correct answer.

(5) Is it fair to put all the responsibility upon our military authorities? If the war wins the whole-hearted support of the nation it is because we fight for an ideal. Has the civilian—and the Christian—population no responsibility as regards the maintenance of that ideal?

MARY MORSHEAD (Teacher of Religious Knowledge).

[We wrote in the article criticized "It is plain that to undertake reprisals for purposes of revenge is utterly un-Christian, but to undertake reprisals for the purpose of protecting English women and children does not stand on the same footing." There is nothing inconsistent therefore in protesting against the recitation of Psalms which breathe a spirit of revenge, and permitting reprisals of which the motive is not revenge but protection. The confusion of thought complained of is not ours.

(1) Our Lord's attitude towards the three persons cited (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) all presuppose the penitence of the persons.

(*a*) Christ's Parable of the Prodigal Son also teaches that Divine forgiveness is extended at once to the penitent. When the prodigal comes to himself, confesses that he has sinned, turns to go home, then his father comes to meet him.

(*b*) The Parable of the Lost Sheep also exhibits the Divine love to penitent sinners. It was uttered to set forth the profound truth that there is more joy in the heart of God when a sinner repents than when a righteous man continues in his righteousness. (Lk. xv. 7).

(*c*) The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard was spoken to set forth the cheering truth that God rewards us according to the use we make of our opportunities, not according to the greatness or smallness of those opportunities. It is the converse of the saying that the stripes given to transgressors are in proportion to their knowledge. This suggests, perhaps, that the representatives of modern culture when they behave barbarously, should be treated more severely than African blacks who do likewise.

None of these incidents or parables conflict with the view that we need to keep both the motives of justice and love before us in our treatment of our fellows. In the case of the impenitent it will be best to allow the motive of justice to prevail; in the case of the penitent, the motive of love.

(2) and (3). For the full answer to these questions we refer our correspondent to the article on "Sentimentalists and Casuists" in this issue.

(4) This question is not one for Christian teachers, but for the English military authorities to answer.

(5) In treating the question of reprisals, we took all the moral responsibility upon ourselves by our conclusion that reprisals are morally justifiable if they can be used effectively. The responsibility of deciding whether reprisals are the most effective means of protecting our unarmed population is one which our military authorities must bear, but Christian teachers ought not to throw the moral responsibility upon them of deciding whether reprisals are right or wrong.—Ed. *M.C.*]

To the Editor of The Modern Churchman.

Your article on Reprisals in your July number will, I trust, call forth any protests from readers of the *Modern Churchman*. If a man attacked our children, would you maintain that "wisdom, justice, and love" justified our attacking, not him, but his children in return? Do you believe that we are morally justified in dropping bombs on German towns of no military importance with a view to murdering German women and children, at the same time declaring that we are doing it for Germany's good?

War is a difficult business, and the more closely the ideals of a nation approximate towards Christianity, the more difficult is the business of war. Methods and ideals are constantly conflicting. The German ideals appear to be deeply tinged with Paganism. Are we to adopt their methods, while we discard their motives? Are we to do exactly the same things that they do, and then to gloss over our actions with talk about Justice, Wisdom, or Love? Such a course would seem to suggest hypocrisy of the worst possible type.

M. R. Jones.

25th July, 1917.

[We refer our correspondent to the article in this issue on Sentimentalists and Casuists which develops the brief article in our July number on Reprisals. Our correspondent asks: "Are we to adopt their methods, while we discard their motives?" This surely is what the State does when it executes murderers. The murderer takes life for various nefarious reasons, the State takes his life to stop him from taking life. Its action is the same, but its motive is different; and it is the motive which is the moral justification of its act.—Ed. *M.C.*].

THE TRAINING OF ORDINANDS.

To the Editor of The Modern Churchman.

That certain defects in the Training of Ordinands constitute an important factor in the Church's failure as a Christian teacher no layman would be disposed to deny. The Memorandum in the March number of the *Modern Churchman* strongly emphasises the fact. It is, indeed, most fortune, and, from an ecclesiastical point of view, unexceptionable. Three learned divines would, naturally, possess all the capital required for making such a pronouncement. Yet one thing is lacking, and that is the ability to grasp fully the lay point of view, a limitation which equally affects the Church as a whole, and forms another important factor in her failure as a Christian teacher.

To a layman, for instance, the list of desiderata on page 582, striking and excellent as they are, would appear, rightly or wrongly, to be formulated without a due sense of proportion. He would consider that number 6 ought to be at the head of the list, that the teaching of Christian ethics is the *end* to be attained by all religious work and effort, and that all other matters referred to are merely subsidiary, or, in other words, are just *means* to attain that end. Interesting and important, no doubt, to theologians, but not appealing with any force to the mind of the average layman. And here I would emphasize the fact that it is of the type of this much despised average layman (and laywoman) that the great body of the Church is made up, not of the clergy and a few select souls who, having caught up a certain shibboleth, would probably be characterised by the former as "religious laymen." I am sure that 2,000 years of Christianity has done more than this, and that many millions of our fellow-countrymen have been all their lives, like "Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme"—not talking prose, but living Christian lives—"without knowing it." For, surely, the Church is not the only source of Christian virtue. The layman, however, must be thankful for small mercies, and rejoice that No. 6 is included in the list at all, and not crowded out by the supposed precedence of other subjects; for the plain, simple manner in which it is introduced, without reservation or apology, suggests that it is, at present, absolutely non-existent in the schools as a subject of instruction. At the back of all this, however, and accounting for much, both of the Church's failure and that of the ecclesiastical criticisms of it, and yet not included in the list of lacking elements is the importance of the study of psychology by the clergy. Man can never understand his fellow-man unless he is either in constant contact with him on even terms, or otherwise takes pains to grasp his mental attitude. This fact is as obvious to the clergy as to the laity, indeed, more so, for the former *feel* the necessity for such mutality. As a rule, I fear, they do not understand the lay mind. Trained themselves in all the ecclesiastical catch-words, they cannot grasp the fact that a layman unversed in ecclesiastical phraseology, and unable at once to reply in suitable or conventional terms, may yet have a deep undercurrent of real religious feeling which, nevertheless, he is unable to put into appropriate words.

A knowledge of "folks" is as necessary as a knowledge of "books." Whether such knowledge can be taught in the schools is perhaps doubtful, except in the case of specially receptive and imaginative minds; but both these qualities can be trained, and are rarely altogether absent. For some, however, it needs actual personal contact with "all sorts and conditions of men." Jack London found that he could not get the men of the East end of London to talk naturally to him, as man to man, until he dressed in rags and tatters. With a clergyman, of course, there are special difficulties in this matter. Men constantly assume an attitude of defence in their presence. This is a difficulty the parson has to overcome. But it *can* be overcome. There is surely no need for "rags and tatters," nor, as has been suggested, a secular life for a number of years as an artisan before ordination: an impossible suggestion, owing to the previous training which would be

quired. A year as an orderly in the R.A.M.C. would probably give more sight into the human mind. Men are not usually so secretive among ctors and in medical surroundings. Indeed, it has been said that doctors e men as they *are*, while clergymen see them at their best and lawyers at eir worst. Yet, after all, it is the personality of the ordinand or priest at matters most. If he has gone through a really efficient course of ychology and mind-study, preferably by a practical psychological specialist, observant man, truly and fully sympathetic and able to see another's int of view, will soon be able to get into close touch with those whom it is s duty and privilege and desire to influence. It is very largely, in many ses, a question of language. He must learn, as he will if he gives his nd to it, the real meaning underlying the common diction and often adequate expression of ideas by the members of his flock. But his mpathy must be whole-hearted, not one-sided, as it often is. May I emplify what I mean? A clergyman who had recently come to a parish in s Rural Deanery was anxious,—truly and honestly anxious,—to get into ich with his parishioners. Meeting one day a young milkman whom he d seen at Church, he asked him how he was getting on with his milk siness. "All right Sir: and how are you getting on with your Church siness?" The clergyman thought it was rather a good joke, and told it as ch. His sympathy was one-sided. He could not, for the life of him, isp the idea that the man was endeavouring, in the best language at his mediate disposal, to reciprocate his sympathy and show his interest in the urch and its incumbent and his work. In reply he only got a snub. Not entionally. The clergyman was far too good a man for that. He also s disappointed, and felt literally "shut up." He did not give the man credit for his good intent. Had he opened his heart to him, had he swered his question by entering into the details of his work and his iculties, I have no doubt he would have found a ready and sympathetic ponse. The man's reserve would gradually have melted away, and propriate words would have come to his lips as the result of confidence l encouragement. It is just cases like this that need drawing out, but a owledge of the workings of the human mind is a necessary preliminary. ck of speech does not imply lack of thought. Laymen, as a rule, have received the careful training in the expression of their thoughts that the rgy have. Most laymen probably think much more than they speak. is, by the way, often makes them worth hearing when they do speak. rsons, as a rule, probably speak more than they think. If, therefore, they ge the ratio of thought to speech by their own personal experience they liable to underestimate the activity and potentiality of the lay intellect. the case above quoted the layman had tried his best to meet the parson f-way, and had failed by reason of the parson's defective mental vision, his inability to see the highest through the inadequate form of speech. cultivation of a strictly correct, not to say, a sesquipedalian diction by clergy may have something to do with this. The acquirement of an urate and expressive language is absolutely indispensable, but if in lying the higher forms of diction we lose the power of interpreting and

and paraphrasing the lower, we are losing more in nature than we gain art. The most impressive speakers, indeed, are, as a rule, those who use th shortest words and the simplest language. The two greatest orators of th last century, Charles Spurgeon and John Bright, used both. The Bisho who, it was said, never used a word of five syllables when he could use on with six, did not even perpetuate his memory. Men may even fail to expre themselves adequately through excess of emotion, and this is a fact whic must always be kept in view. It would be a great advance towards mutu understanding if the parson were always to assume the best and highe possible motive as the spring of others' words and actions. It would oft prove to be the true one.

If there is more Faith in honest doubt than in half the creeds, the is also surely more Faith in honest silence than in the self-confide claim to election and grace. It is the "stammerer," the wordless Publica the tearful, speechless penitent, not the "converted," self-sufficient Pharise who need comfort, and for whose sake the gospel was proclaimed.

St. John the Baptist, so far as one can judge, studied his psycholo alone in the wilderness of Judaea. St. Paul studied his both in the schoo of the Pharisees and in the Arabian desert. Yet both were adepts psychology. The Baptist could penetrate the heart of kings as well as Pharisees, Publicans, soldiers, and "multitudes." St. Paul, as he himse tells us, was "all things to all men." In both cases it was the intense y comprehending sympathy, combined with equally intense study of t human mind, which brought about the result. Yet neither of them work in a factory. It has been said that in the present day the wisdom whi understands the world is no longer compatible with the Faith whi overcomes it. Be it so, Let us aim, then, at the wisdom that understan it, and gives of the fruits of that wisdom to others as they are able to be it, "precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line up line; here a little, and there a little;" perhaps, too, even with "strange lip and unfamiliar slang, in the case of some. Then, if the rare possessor the "Faith that overcometh the world" does not appear, we must, wisdom and sympathy, overcome it in sections. If he does come, the wo will be prepared to receive him.

It was related in a recently published journal that a chaplain, who h been some time at the front, put up a placard outside his trench label "The Vicarage." Two privates, recently arrived, walked past it. "Hul Bill," said one, "here's a b——y Vicarage!" "Yes," said the chapla appearing at the opening, "and here's the b——y Vicar! Now, what ca do for you?" They became his firm friends and disciples. He h "stooped to conquer." By his knowledge of psychology, plus his t sympathy with his fellow-man, he had, using the wisdom of the serpent applying the test of language, overcome one section, and captured t human souls.

8, *Royal Avenue, S.W., June 1st*, 1917. J. FOSTER PALMER

*** The Editor regrets that limitations of space have prevented the publication of a number of letters